

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges

VOLUME XVII

MARCH, 1931

NUMBER 1

Edited by

ROBERT L. KELLY

Executive Secretary of the Association

MARTHA T. BOARDMAN

Editorial Assistant

ARCHIE M. PALMER

Contributing Editor

Published by the

Association of American Colleges

Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

Editorial Offices

111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

March, May, November, December

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

h.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1931-32

PRESIDENT:

President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

VICE-PRESIDENT:

Registrar J. P. Mitchell, Stanford University

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY:

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City

TREASURER:

President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College

CUSTODIAN OF FUNDS:

Bank of New York and Trust Company, New York City

ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University

President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University

Rector James H. Ryan, The Catholic University of America

REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:

Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo (one year)

President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College (two years)

President J. Edgar Park, Wheaton College (Mass.) (three years)

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION:

President W. M. Lewis, Lafayette College

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Association of American Colleges

President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College

President R. E. Blackwell, Randolph-Macon College

NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON STANDARD REPORTS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College

Professor Floyd Reeves, The University of Chicago

President E. E. Rall, North Central College

Ass't Secretary, J. C. Christensen, University of Michigan.

Controller G. C. Wintringer, Princeton University

Professor E. S. Evenden, Teachers College

President George F. Zook, University of Akron

Bulletin of the Association of American Colleges 3

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:

Professor Arthur H. Compton, The University of Chicago, 1931-32

COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS:

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman*
 President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation
 President W. P. Few, Duke University
 Mr. J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College
 Mr. A. B. Ruddock, Occidental College

COMMISSION ON THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*
 Controller C. C. Wintringer, Princeton University
 Controller Lloyd Morey, University of Illinois
 Auditor N. C. Plimpton, The University of Chicago
 Controller Robert B. Stewart, Purdue University

COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS:

President F. L. McVey, University of Kentucky, *Chairman*
 Director C. H. Judd, The University of Chicago
 President David A. Robertson, Goucher College

COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS:

President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University, *Chairman*
 President Albert Britt, Knox College
 Dean Marshall S. Brown, New York University
 Dean Charles L. Raper, Syracuse University
 President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP:

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College, *Chairman*
 Dean C. S. Boucher, The University of Chicago
 Dean C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College
 Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo
 President C. D. Gray, Bates College

COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS:

Dr. A. W. Anthony, Trustee, Bates College, *Chairman*
 Treasurer Charles T. Brown, Swarthmore College
 Treasurer F. L. Jackson, Davidson College
 President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College
 Ass't-Treasurer Raymond L. Thompson, University of Rochester

COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS:

The President, *ex officio*
 The Executive Secretary, *ex officio*
 The Treasurer, *ex officio*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE ACTIVITIES OF THE YEAR

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Intellectual Life in the Colleges, The President's Address, <i>Luther P. Eisenhart</i> | 5 |
| Report of the Executive Committee and Executive Secretary, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i> | 9 |
| Report of the Treasurer, 1930, <i>William Mather Lewis</i> | 20 |
| Reports of the Permanent Commissions: | |
| Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, <i>Ernest H. Wilkins</i> | 24 |
| Faculty and Student Scholarship, <i>Henry M. Wriston</i> | 37 |
| Permanent and Trust Funds, <i>Alfred Williams Anthony</i> | 41 |
| Educational Surveys, <i>Frank L. McVey</i> | 49 |
| Report for the Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning, <i>Donald J. Cowling</i> | 51 |

THE COLLEGE AND THE FINE ARTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Art and the College, <i>Lorado Taft</i> | 56 |
| Music in the Curriculum, <i>John Erskine</i> | 66 |

THE COLLEGES AND MASS EDUCATION

| | |
|---|----|
| The Peril in Mass Education, <i>Melvin E. Haggerty</i> | 74 |
| The Harvard House Plan, <i>A. Lawrence Lowell</i> | 89 |
| Mass Education at College Level, <i>Kerr D. Macmillan</i> | 97 |

FUNCTIONS OF THE COLLEGE

| | |
|---|-----|
| College Men in Business, <i>R. I. Rees</i> | 112 |
| The College as a Conservator of the Best Literature, <i>Joseph Wharton Lippincott</i> | 119 |
| The Function of the College in the State University, <i>William Lowe Bryan</i> | 126 |
| The Function of the College in the Independent University, <i>George A. Works</i> | 130 |
| The Function of the Independent College, <i>Marion E. Park</i> | 139 |

OFFICIAL RECORDS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Minutes of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting, <i>Archie M. Palmer</i> | 146 |
| Members of the Association, 1931 | 154 |
| The Constitution and By-Laws | 166 |
| Former Presidents of the Association | 168 |

The BULLETIN of the Association of American Colleges is indexed in *The Education Index*.

INTELLECTUAL LIFE IN THE COLLEGES

The Annual Address of the President of the Association

LUTHER P. EISENHART

DEAN OF THE FACULTY, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

IN accordance with the program of events, there is the announcement that at this time I am to make an Annual Address. It is not my intention, however, to go into a lengthy discussion of some educational question, because as a matter of fact, probably if I did go into a discussion of that sort, I would be led to touch and develop, but in a much more unsatisfactory manner, some of the ideas that were presented this afternoon and which will be presented tomorrow.

Although this Association is concerned with the various questions involved with the college of liberal arts and sciences as is shown by the large number of committees which deal with various questions of the liberal college and by the reports from time to time that appear in the BULLETIN, yet I think we all agree that the main purpose of the Association is to deal with the educational side of the college, or what President Lowell referred to as the inside part.

However, as Dr. Kelly remarked this morning, in the last two or three years the Association has given particular attention to the question of what efforts the colleges could make to develop a more appropriate intellectual attitude toward study on the part of the students.

This question has been up for consideration these few years. A statement underlying it has been presented in the BULLETIN. In the meantime there have been other agencies in the country which have been carrying on certain investigations along the lines that probably originally were in the mind of the Executive Committee when it was discussing these questions. I may mention in particular the committees which have been formed by the American Council on Education, one of which has now received a substantial subvention, and is more particularly concerned with the question of suitable measures of student achievement. That committee is working under the direction of one of

the well known members of this organization, and from time to time I think will make interesting reports, which will be of value to the colleges of the country. Of course, they are concerned with the question of suitable measures of student achievement, but we all realize that no matter how well these measures are taken, the achievement of the student in the examinations, is, after all, secondary to the effect upon the student of taking these examinations and preparing for them.

In this announcement which has been made in the BULLETIN of the program for the development of the intellectual life in the colleges, there were listed six, seven or a dozen various methods and means which are being used in different colleges throughout the country, which in the opinion of this Association are worthy of investigation. However, the Executive Committee, after discussing this matter this year, has come to the conclusion that rather than try to approach all these questions at once, it is better to see what can be done in the way of an investigation of one of them. Accordingly, the Executive Committee has drawn up the following statement which I am going to read to you.

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RESULTS OF
COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS IN COLLEGES OF
LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

During the past ten years or more there has been a movement in the American college of liberal arts and sciences to get away from the purely credit system in the determination of qualifications for graduation, in the desire to raise the intellectual tone of the college and give the student a more substantial training. This trend has found expression in the form of a general or comprehensive examination upon a field of concentration, and this examination is held toward the end of a student's senior year. In most of the colleges which have adopted this plan it has been limited to students who show ability above the average, and special willingness to apply themselves to their studies. In general, the examinations have been given to students who have followed a program of Honors Courses. In certain other institutions the comprehensive examination upon the field of concentration has been given to all students as one of the requirements for graduation.

The introduction of the comprehensive examination has led to a revision of courses and a development of new methods of

instruction, as well as to methods of testing more adequately the student's understanding of his field.

In connection with the comprehensive examinations there has developed a variety of methods of conducting the examinations themselves. The essential features of these various methods are known only to comparatively few men engaged in college education.

The added cost of maintaining courses of study and a personnel adapted to the development of a satisfactory system of comprehensive examinations should be inquired into and the results carefully set forth. It is sometimes asserted that colleges with meager resources cannot successfully adopt a comprehensive examination plan.

In a number of institutions the comprehensive examination has been operating sufficiently long to justify an attempt to measure the progress of students who have subjected themselves to this system. No doubt graduate and professional schools which have enrolled students of this kind have data on this point of value to the colleges.

In the institutions where comprehensive examinations are in use faculty members are somewhat divided in their evaluation of the system. Colleges of the country would be helped if they had a definite statement pro and con on this subject.

These endeavors have been carried on for a sufficient length of time to justify an objective study of the results, which should yield an opinion concerning the effectiveness of this plan in producing a better attitude of mind toward college studies and a better type of training of undergraduates. If it is found that the results have justified the experiment, this information should be made available to the colleges of the Association in such detail that any college may determine whether with its resources at hand certain elements of these various endeavors could be adopted to good advantage, and, if the funds are not available, to what extent it would be necessary to augment them.

It is proposed that the Association of American Colleges secure a suitable investigator who would visit selected colleges, in which a comprehensive examination has been used on an extended scale and for a sufficient length of time, and make a detailed report of the results, and of the various methods which have been adopted to produce the results desired by the colleges which have instituted such plans.

It might be best for this investigator to visit a number of colleges in a somewhat exploratory manner and to concentrate on an intensive study of a small number of institutions. It is suggested that he should be a man of extensive experience in college administration and one who has had much experience in college surveys. This investigator should endeavor to discover

to what extent a program in operation has affected the whole intellectual tone of the institution, whether applied to a limited group of students in any one class or to all of them. The report upon the methods used should be in sufficient detail to enable a college to determine in what manner it might revise its curriculum and develop its teaching force so as to take advantage of this system, if it is reported that in the various colleges in which such systems are in operation the results justify a trial of some phases of this program by other institutions.

You see, then, that what the Executive Committee is proposing to do is to have this question investigated. Their interest in it is two-fold: one, so that we may have an objective report on this subject; and two, that it be presented in such a form that the advantages of the various systems, such as they are, may be presented in such a manner that many of the colleges of the country may be in a position to decide whether to adopt certain, or all, of their features.

As I say, this report has been adopted by the Executive Committee, and that Committee has taken steps to see whether an investigator of this kind can not only be secured, but provided for. We have no announcement to make that this has been accomplished. However, we are hoping that it will be accomplished, and the members of the present Executive Committee are glad to express the hope that the Executive Committee which you elect tomorrow to succeed us, will soon have an opportunity to proceed along this line, and to be guided in the investigation of what we think is a very important matter.

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AND THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR 1930-31

ROBERT L. KELLY

To the Members of the Association:

FIRST of all, I wish personally to thank the members of the Association, in this formal way, for the short vacation extended so graciously with stipend a year ago, repeating that of two years ago already acknowledged, and to report that the month of February, 1930, was spent in visiting colleges in the South and in a short sojourn in Florida and Havana.

OUR GUESTS

We welcome to this meeting a distinguished group of our honorary members whose presence here is greatly appreciated: Professor H. W. Tyler, General Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Kathryn McHale, Executive and Educational Secretary of the American Association of University Women, Washington, D. C.; Dr. John H. McCracken, Assistant Director of the American Council on Education, Washington, D. C.; Mr. Robert M. Lester, Assistant to the President of the Carnegie Corporation, New York City; Dr. David H. Stevens, Vice-President of the General Education Board, New York City; Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education, New York City; Dr. Walton C. John, of the United States Office of Education, Washington, D. C.; and Dr. Edwin B. Wilson, President of the Social Science Research Council, New York City.

THE ENLARGED OFFICE FACILITIES

The Association has now operated for the second year on a budget practically double that of any year previous to 1929. The doubling of the membership fee has in no sense interfered with the steady increase in applications for membership. Last year twenty colleges were admitted to the Association and there are twenty-five applications now approved by the Executive

Committee. With the exception of some liberal colleges in state universities, there are very few eligible colleges not now enrolled in the Association.

Already the office space has been more than comfortably occupied and a still further expansion of personnel and equipment is needed to meet increasing demands. Reference may be made particularly to the rapidly enlarging consultative function of the Association headquarters.

THE ASSOCIATION LIBRARY

To facilitate the activities of the Association the library has been enlarged and a complete catalogue made. The library attempts to have available every important book and document bearing on the manifold problems of the American liberal college. When the Association was organized in January, 1915, there was very little literature in permanent form in this field. As late as six years ago only a few new titles were appearing annually. This year approximately 150 new books and theses have been received in the office, most of which were published within the year. Particular reference should be made to the cordial response of the university presses and the great graduate schools to our invitation to deposit in the Association library their publications, including dissertations on educational subjects accepted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of doctor of philosophy. Columbia University and Teachers College, the University of Chicago, the University of Illinois, Ohio State University, the University of Minnesota, the University of Washington, Stanford University, and the University of Iowa have been particularly generous. Other graduate schools are furnishing abstracts or lists of dissertations and theses.

Most requests for information and counsel come from within the executive and professorial ranks of Association colleges but in increased measure the office is being drawn upon by candidates for higher degrees who are engaged in writing dissertations. Assistance is sought and given in blocking out areas, defining limitations and organizing procedures of investigation. There are now engaged in one of our projects six mature and experienced graduate students, all but one of whom are making the material in our office the basis for doctor's or master's dissertations. The

office is in intimate touch with research workers in many research foundations. The Social Science Research Council in particular is pointing out numerous areas of possible contact between that Council and the Association.

POPULAR INTEREST IN THE COLLEGE

When we turn from the technical literature to the popular magazines we find a greater output dealing with the colleges than the high record registered a year ago. The era of depression has not extended to those employed in producing literature dealing with college problems. It is gratifying to report the wide and increasing circulation of the Association BULLETIN and of other literature and of the books published by the Association—particularly *Tendencies in College Administration*, now out of print, and *The Effective College*, which leads all other books in this field in its accessibility to administrators, faculties, graduate students and other professional readers. There is a continuing demand for both books.

THE ADVISORY GROUP ON COLLEGE LIBRARIES

The Advisory Group on College Libraries of the Carnegie Corporation is made up as follows: Dr. W. W. Bishop, Librarian, University of Michigan; President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College; Dean Virginia Gildersleeve, Barnard College; President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College; Librarian Andrew Keogh, Yale University; Mr. Carl H. Milam, Executive Secretary of the American Library Association; Professor Douglas Waples, University of Chicago; Librarian Louis R. Wilson, University of North Carolina; President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College; President William M. Lewis, Lafayette College, and Robert L. Kelly. Professor William M. Randall, of the Graduate Library School of the University of Chicago, has served as field representative, and Mr. Charles B. Shaw, of Swarthmore, as compiler of information as to book lists. This group has canvassed many applications for grants and has recommended the appropriation of a sum aggregating about \$800,000 for the purchase of books for college libraries. The group also has supervised the production of extensive lists of books suitable for college libraries and many colleges are now engaged in checking their catalogues with reference to these lists.

COLLEGE LIBRARY BUILDINGS

Mr. James T. Gerould, Librarian of Princeton University, has made progress in the production of the book on college library buildings to which reference was made a year ago. Mr. Gerould has visited numerous Eastern institutions and is now making trips to the Mississippi Valley, the Southern and the Pacific States. He hopes to have the book ready for publication before the end of 1931. This work is being done under a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation which was paid to the Association treasury during the past year.

THE ARCHITECTURAL SERVICE

Much additional architectural material has been received from the colleges, particularly from the Pacific States and the Southwest, and the office bureau has many contacts.

The demands upon the Association's architectural advisor have called for services far beyond what could reasonably be expected from a voluntary worker. A special request has come that the bureau take the lead in guiding the production of plans for faculty houses on and adjacent to the campuses. The Executive Committee suggests that these matters be given the careful consideration of the Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts.

OTHER COMMISSIONS

During the year the office has collaborated also with the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship, the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, and has carried on a further extension of its study of college surveys begun two years ago by the Commission on Educational Surveys. All these Commissions report at this session.

REPRESENTATIVES ON THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION, U. S. OFFICE

At the invitation of the Commissioner of Education, Presidents William M. Lewis, Frank Aydelotte, R. E. Blackwell, W. W. Boyd and Robert L. Kelly have been added to the National Advisory Committee on Education of the United States Office.

THE SMALLER COLLEGE STUDY

In accordance with the action taken at the last annual meeting of the Association, plans have been initiated during the year for a study of "The Smaller College" and its place in the American scheme of higher education. As reported in the November, 1930, *BULLETIN*, the original plan was to confine the study to those members of the Association having enrolments of 500 students or less, and an invitation to participate in the study was extended to those colleges. A number of colleges having over 500 students requested inclusion in the study, and a few such institutions were accepted. At the present time there are 110 colleges cooperating in this study.

The study covers the areas of (1) educational policy, (2) organization and administration, (3) personnel, (4) student supply and alumni, (5) instructional facilities and techniques, (6) physical plant, (7) financial situation and needs, and (8) such selected areas as student life, religious life, personnel guidance, extra-curriculum activities, enrolment trends and special activities. Brief detailed schedules formulated in the office of the Association and approved by the Executive Committee have been prepared and sent to the colleges.

Specific data have already been gathered on boards of control, on faculty organization, on aims and objectives, on the contributions of the colleges to their communities, and on the recognition of their worth and service. In a number of institutions, at their special request, more intensive studies are being made on the composition, background and attitudes of the freshmen, on officers' and faculties' attitudes toward fundamental educational concepts, and on the contributions which members of boards of trustees aspire to make to college administration.

As the study develops and significant findings come to light, these findings are brought to the attention of the colleges, and it is hoped general analyses of the various areas may be published. As an immediate service growing out of the study comparable situations in other colleges are brought to the attention of co-operating colleges making local studies of specific problems.

THE UNIFORM STATISTICAL REPORT

Two years ago the Association acted favorably upon a suggestion from the Council of Church Boards of Education that

a joint committee be formed to extend further an initial investigation the Council had made into the feasibility of a uniform statistical report blank for colleges. The Association accepted the suggestion and appointed President D. J. Cowling and others to this joint committee. Since that date the committee has invited other participants to join them and the agencies now represented on the enlarged National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning are the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Church Boards of Education, the Association of University and College Business Officers of the Eastern States, the Association of University and College Business Officers of the Western States, the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association, and the Business Officers of Pacific Coast Universities and Colleges, the American Association of Collegiate Registrars, and the American Association of Teachers Colleges. The United States Office of Education and the American Council on Education have been invited to be associated with the Committee in the project. The General Education Board has generously made an appropriation of \$25,000 for the use of the Committee.

INTELLECTUAL LIFE PROJECT

For the third successive year reference is made in this report to the Intellectual Life Project. The Executive Committee has given careful attention to the matter since the Washington meeting and has approved for the present an investigation of the comprehensive examination as a specially significant phase of the whole problem. The Executive Committee is not asking the Association solemnly to resolve that the comprehensive examination is a universal cure for academic ills. It does propose that a searching investigation be made of this device, upon which much time, effort and money have been spent in the interests of many thousands of students, and it submits a formula to that end.

This Association, to be sure, has no copyright on the Intellectual Life Project. The phrase, although coined by the Association, has been generally approved by individual educators, by institutions and by foundations for research. A distinguished specialist in higher education has asserted that the idea has

fertilized many minds. Many other organizations are working on phases of the same problem.

The formula submitted has not only been approved by unanimous vote of the Association's Executive Committee but by a large group of men and women actively affiliated with this Association, including those whose institutions have been using the comprehensive examination. Because of its importance the subject is being treated at more length by Dean Eisenhart in his presidential address.

THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE MOVEMENT

At its meeting on January 21, 1931, the Liberal Arts College Movement voted that its object was to cooperate with approved colleges of liberal arts in securing funds adequate to their needs and to this end to set forth the place of the college of liberal arts in higher education in the United States. Since this object has never been a purpose of the Association of American Colleges, either as defined by its constitution and by-laws or as developed in practice, the Executive Committee is of the opinion that the Association and the Liberal Arts College Movement should seek to accomplish their purposes independently but with the spirit of cooperation, and that to this end the Association should make available to the Liberal Arts College Movement such information concerning college education not of a confidential nature as it has in its office and which may be desired by the Liberal Arts College Movement. In this connection, it should be pointed out that the budget of the Association for 1931 includes an item of \$2,000 for continuation of the study of "The Smaller College," which study is now in progress.

THE ASSOCIATION'S CONTRIBUTION TO FINANCIAL PUBLICITY

In the November issue of the *BULLETIN* the financial programs of sixty-three colleges were published in detail. These programs are all approved by the several boards of trustees and form the matured basis of appeal therefore of the colleges to the public. From these it appears that some colleges have definite objectives extending over a period of twenty years, others over fifteen, ten, five and shorter and indefinite periods. Other material bearing on financial phases of administration believed to be of value to

the colleges, was published in the November and December issues of the BULLETIN.

It appears that during the year 1929 a sum in excess of the total year's income of the Government of France or that of Germany, or that of the United States Steel Corporation was given to educational, philanthropic, religious and other charitable organizations in the United States. The gross income of American philanthropy ranks third among the large incomes in the world, being surpassed only by the income of the United States Government and that of the British Government. While the largest proportion of the total went to religious purposes, the second largest sum went to education, and of the estimated total going to education, the largest sum went to our colleges and universities. While the results have not yet been verified, the present indications are that the totals for 1929 were surpassed in 1930. There are certain principles of great significance that seem to emerge: (1) the largest individual gifts go to educational purposes; (2) there is a tendency to provide for the welfare of the present generation rather than for making provision in perpetuity; (3) decreases in time of economic stress are likely to come from the smaller givers; (4) there is a growing sense of the responsibilities of wealth, which is not lessened but rather increased in times of economic stress; and (5) remarkable to say—even some rural colleges the past year have successfully completed financial campaigns.

CHANGE IN CONSTITUTION

At the meeting a year ago the following resolution was presented to the Association, and has been held over in accordance with the requirements of the constitution:

Resolved, That the sentence under "Officers" in the constitution which reads, "The Association shall also elect two others who, with the four officers named above (that is, the President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer) shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association," shall be changed to read, "The Association shall elect four others, etc."

The Executive Committee now recommends that this matter be referred to the Committee on Resolutions for action at this meeting.

MEMBERSHIP LIST

At the close of the last meeting the Association had 421 members. During the year two institutions asked and received from the Executive Committee permission to withdraw for reasons of academic status; Carnegie Institute of Technology (technical school) and Rio Grande (junior college); two were merged with other institutions, Lombard with Knox, Chicora with Queens; two will be dropped by constitutional provision at this meeting, Upper Iowa and Mississippi Woman's College (Hattiesburg) (non-payment of dues for two years).

APPLICATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The applications of the following institutions have been approved by the Executive Committee which recommends their admission to membership at this meeting:

Albany College, Albany, Oregon.
Barnard College, New York, N. Y.
Battle Creek College, Battle Creek, Mich.
The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.
Good Counsel College, White Plains, N. Y.
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.
Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va.
Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood, Cal.
Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, N. C.
LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.
La Verne College, La Verne, Cal.
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, N. C.
Loyola University, New Orleans, La.
Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa.
Mount St. Joseph College, Chestnut Hill, Pa.
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, Cal.
Nazareth College, Rochester, N. Y.
Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.
Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa.
Saint Bonaventure's College, Saint Bonaventure, N. Y.
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.
Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Tex.
Union University, Jackson, Tenn.
Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va.

The Executive Committee proposes the following budget for the year ending January, 1932, to be subject to amendment by the new Executive Committee:

ASSOCIATION BUDGET, 1931*

Income

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Balance on hand, Bank of New York & Trust Co. Jan. 1, 1931 | \$ 6,645.49 |
| Balance of 1930 appropriation to Headquarters Office unspent Jan. 1, 1931 | 891.28 |

Estimated Receipts for the Year, 1931:

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Membership dues—438 at \$50.00 each | \$21,900.00 |
| A. A. C. BULLETIN (sales) | 2,500.00 |
| <i>The Effective College</i> (sales) | 100.00 |
| Miscellaneous (including Bank interest) | 200.00 |
| | <u>24,700.00</u> |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Total Income plus Bank and Office Acct. Balances | <u>\$32,236.77</u> |
|--|--------------------|

Disbursements

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Annual Meeting | \$ 800.00 |
| Dues—American Council on Education | 100.00 |
| Executive Committee Expenses | 500.00 |
| Permanent Commissions' Expenses | 500.00 |
| Treasurer's Office Expenses (Bank fee of \$400.00, etc.) | 500.00 |
| A. A. C. BULLETIN (publication) | 3,500.00 |
| <i>Christian Education</i> Subscriptions (438) | 438.00 |
| Production of Book on College Library Buildings | 1,500.00 |

Expenses of Headquarters' Office:

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Rent | \$ 2,250.00 |
| Office Expenses (including \$200.00 for "The Smaller College Study") | 1,250.00 |
| Office Equipment (including additions to library) | 300.00 |
| Travel Account | 300.00 |
| Miscellaneous (Emergency) | 150.00 |
| Salaries (including \$1,800.00 for "The Smaller College Study") | 18,740.00 |
| | <u>\$22,990.00</u> |
| Dr. Kelly's Insurance | 480.00 |
| <i>The Effective College</i> (distribution) | 50.00 |
| Contingent Fund | 300.00 |

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Total Disbursements, 1931 | 31,658.00 |
| Anticipated Balance on hand, December 31, 1931 | 578.77 |
| | <u>\$32,236.77</u> |

* Printed as approved by the Executive Committee January 29, 1931. See Minutes of the Annual Meeting, p. 146.

PROGRAM OF THIS MEETING

The general idea of the program this year is organized around four main lines of thought, underneath all of which is the growing conception of the need of emphasizing the meaning of the intellectual life in its manifold expressions. There is to be (a) a presentation of the work of the Association office and its officers for the year, and some of its Commissions—those that have been most active; (b) another contribution, as last year, by the Association to the development toward an appreciation of the fine arts; (c) a frank discussion, from different points of view, of mass education on the college level, and (d) a renewed facing of the ever changing currents in the main stream of liberal education.

SPECIAL SUBSCRIPTION OFFER

Members of the Association have the privilege of a special subscription rate for board of directors and faculty. For several years the Executive Committee offered single subscriptions for two years at \$1.00, or annual subscriptions in clubs at fifty cents each. To members, the price of single copies has been twenty-five cents, except for the March issue containing the Proceedings of the Annual Meeting, which has been seventy-five cents.

In view of the additional clerical expense for *single subscriptions*, the special rate for these beginning with the present volume (1931) will be \$1.00 per annum. Club subscriptions of ten or more copies to be mailed to one address will remain fifty cents each per annum as heretofore. The charge for single copies is unchanged.

The regular price of an annual subscription to the BULLETIN is \$3.00; ordinary single copies, seventy-five cents; the March issue (Proceedings), \$2.00.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES FOR THE YEAR 1930.

TO the Association of American Colleges:

Your Treasurer begs to submit the following report for the year ended December 31, 1930:

I. A Statement of Cash Receipts and Disbursements prepared by the Bank of New York and Trust Company, which was designated by the Executive Committee, January, 1930, as Custodian of Funds for the Association.

Balance on hand, January 1, 1930..... \$ 7,700.08

Receipts

Membership Dues:

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------|
| 1929— 6 at \$50..... | \$ 300.00 |
| 1930—408 at 50..... | 20,400.00 |
| 1931— 1 at 50..... | 50.00 |
| | <hr/> \$20,750.00 |

Bulletin

| | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| Regular sales | 2,439.10 |
| Offprint sales | 215.37 |
| | <hr/> 2,654.47 |

| | |
|--|-------|
| College Architecture in America—sales..... | 68.94 |
|--|-------|

| | |
|----------------------------------|--------|
| The Effective College—sales..... | 217.12 |
|----------------------------------|--------|

| | |
|--|----------|
| From Carnegie Corporation, for book on The College Library | 2,000.00 |
|--|----------|

| | |
|----------------------------|--------|
| Interest on Deposits | 318.51 |
|----------------------------|--------|

| | |
|-----------------------------|-------|
| Miscellaneous Receipts..... | 6.50 |
| | <hr/> |

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Total receipts, 1930..... | <hr/> \$26,015.54 |
|---------------------------|-------------------|

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Total receipts plus bank balance..... | <hr/> \$33,715.62 |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|

Disbursements

| | |
|---------------------|-----------|
| Annual Meeting..... | \$ 802.39 |
|---------------------|-----------|

| | |
|---|--------|
| Dues—American Council on Education..... | 100.00 |
|---|--------|

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------|
| Executive Committee Expenses..... | 169.64 |
|-----------------------------------|--------|

Bulletin Publication Expenses:

| | |
|--------------------|----------------|
| Regular a/c..... | \$ 3,216.49 |
| Offprint a/c | 197.81 |
| | <hr/> 3,414.30 |

| | |
|---|--------|
| Christian Education Subscriptions | 422.00 |
|---|--------|

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|
| Expenses of Treasurer's Office | 437.74 |
|--------------------------------------|--------|

Report of the Treasurer for 1930

21

| | |
|--|--|
| Expenses of Permanent Commissions..... | 321.78 |
| Special Committees (D. J. Cowling, Chairman) | |
| A. Types of Colleges..... \$ | 106.97 |
| B. Statistical Reports..... | 143.47 |
| | <hr/> 250.44 |
| Prof. J. T. Gerould,—book on College Library | |
| Buildings | 500.00 |
| Expenses of Headquarters Office..... | 19,300.00 |
| Dr. Kelly's Insurance..... | 480.00 |
| Dr. Kelly's Vacation..... | 500.00 |
| The Effective College—distribution..... | 40.00 |
| College Architecture in America—distribution..... | 32.02 |
| The Intellectual Life Project..... | 15.98 |
| "The Smaller College" Study..... | 283.84 |
| | <hr/> |
| Total disbursements..... | \$27,070.13 |
| Balance on hand, December 31, 1930..... | \$ 6,645.49 |
| | <hr/> |
| Total | \$33,715.62 |
| Cash on deposit with the Bank of New York and Trust Company: | |
| Regular account..... | \$5,145.49 |
| Time account..... | 1,500.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| Total | \$6,645.49 |
| | <hr/> |
| | BANK OF NEW YORK AND TRUST COMPANY, Custodian of Funds. |
| | By: (Signed) CHARLES ELDREDGE, Vice President. |

II. A General Statement of the Financial Condition of the Association prepared by the Custodian of Funds, as of January 14, 1931.

| | | |
|--|--|-------------|
| | <i>Assets</i> | |
| Cash in Bank—Current a/c January 1, 1931..... | \$ | 5,145.49 |
| Cash in Bank—Special Fund, January 1, 1931..... | | 1,500.00 |
| Due from Council of Church Boards of Education, a/c payment on Headquarters Office Expenses | | 891.28 |
| Value of Furniture and Fixtures as per adjustment ordered by Dr. R. L. Kelly as of January 14, 1931 | | 1,632.74 |
| | <hr/> | \$ 9,169.51 |
| | <hr/> | |
| | <i>Liabilities and Capital Investments</i> | |
| Cash in Bank, January 1, 1930..... | \$ | 7,700.08 |
| Cash held in Special Fund, January 1, 1931..... | | 1,500.00 |

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Balance carried forward | \$9,200.08 |
| Value of Furniture and Fixtures, as per adjustment ordered by Dr. R. L. Kelly as of January 14, 1931 | 1,632.74 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$10,832.82 |
| Less Net Deficit for year 1930: | |
| Receipts as per cash statement | \$26,015.54 |
| Less cash received for Special Fund | 2,000.00 |
| | <hr/> |
| Net receipts for Current a/c | \$24,015.54 |
| Plus amount due from Council of Church Boards of Education | 891.28 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$24,906.82 |
| Disbursements as per cash statement | \$27,070.13 |
| Less payment made for Special Fund | 500.00 |
| Total Disbursements—Current a/c | 26,570.13 |
| Net Deficit for year 1930 | 1,663.31 |
| | <hr/> |
| | \$ 9,169.51 |

Bank of New York and Trust Company

By: (Signed) CHARLES ELDREDGE,

Vice President.

We hereby certify that the statement of cash receipts and disbursements of the Association of American Colleges for the year ended December 31, 1930, as submitted by this Company, as Custodian of Funds for the Association, is correct and true; and that the statement of financial condition, as submitted under date of January 14, 1931, is in our opinion a true statement of the financial condition of the Association of American Colleges.

BANK OF NEW YORK AND TRUST COMPANY, Custodian of Funds.

By (Signed) CHARLES ELDREDGE, *Vice-President.*

Jan. 20, 1931.

III. *Supplementary Memoranda.*

1. Of the total bank balance, December 31, 1930—\$6,645.49, \$5,145.49 represent the actual working funds of the Association, and \$1,500.00 the balance of the appropriation from the Carnegie Corporation for the production of a book on college library buildings. (The original subvention was \$2,000.00, of which \$500.00 has been spent).

2. Excluding bank balance, 1930, and the Carnegie gift, the total receipts for the year 1930 were \$24,015.54; the total dis-

bursements \$26,570.13, a difference of \$2,554.59, which represents the amount by which the balance in actual operating funds has been diminished during the year (from \$7,700.08 to \$5,145.09).

3. The General Statement of Financial Condition shows a balance of \$891.28 in the Headquarters Office Account. More than one third of this balance was due not to overestimation of necessary expenditures but the allocation of portions of staff salaries to the account of other budget items, which might not occur again. The amount actually spent for salaries was \$15,778.19, the budget appropriation \$15,856.68. Office expense and travel showed some saving over budget allowance.

4. On our book entitled *The Effective College*, the profits for the year have been \$177.12. For last year \$414.67. The total profits to date on this publication are \$1,359.42. There are 322 copies unsold and accounts receivable \$26.44. This book is sold at \$2.00 per copy. With valuation at 50 per cent we may hope to realize approximately \$350.00 more from future sales. There was also a profit on the book *College Architecture in America* of \$36.92 the past year.

5. Nine colleges were reported in arrears for annual dues for 1930, two of them for 1929 as well—a total of \$550.00. These accounts receivable being of a doubtful character were not included in the assets of the Association.

The colleges in arrears for two years and by constitutional provision dropped from the roster of the Association are Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa, and Mississippi Woman's College, Hattiesburg, Miss. While seven other colleges had not paid the membership fee for the current year at the close of business, December 31, 1930, checks on this account have subsequently been received from two of these.

Respectfully submitted,

(Signed) WILLIAM MATHER LEWIS, *Treasurer*.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE TEACHERS

ERNEST H. WILKINS, CHAIRMAN
PRESIDENT OF OBERLIN COLLEGE

THIS Commission has a double title and function. It is a Commission on the Enlistment and Training of College Teachers. Two years ago the Commission presented a report dealing with the training of college teachers. Copies of that report are still available in the office of the Association and may be had on request.

This morning the Commission is presenting a report on the other half of its field, namely, upon the enlistment of college teachers. Before I come, however, to the presentation of that new report, I should like to review very briefly some of the results which have followed from the action of this Association in the adoption two years ago of our report on the training of college teachers.

In March, 1929, at the meeting of the North Central Association, the report of the Committee on the Professional Qualifications of College Teachers, submitted to that body, quoted in full, and with approval, the report of this Commission, and in its own recommendations paralleled the recommendations of this Commission. The recommendations of that Committee were transmitted by the North Central Association to all of the graduate schools concerned, thus re-enforcing the recommendations which went directly from this Association to the graduate schools.

At that same meeting of the North Central Association, another committee, that on Faculty Scholarship, quoted in full the report of this Commission, with approval.

In the summer of 1930, the University of Chicago, as a result of these various actions, held an institute for administrative officers upon the theme "The Training of College Teachers, including their Preliminary Preparation and In-service Improvement."

At that institute, which was largely attended, some twenty addresses on various phases of this problem were made. The proceedings of that institute, including all the addresses, have

been published in a volume called *The Training of College Teachers*, edited by Dean Gray of the University of Chicago. This volume, published by the University of Chicago Press, is now the major document in this field. The address by Dean Gray, which is incorporated in this volume, is the most up-to-date summary of what various graduate schools are doing in the training of college teachers.

The Association of American Universities, as a result of communications from this Association, appointed a committee on the problem of the graduate training of prospective college teachers. That Committee presented a long report at its meeting at San Francisco this autumn. That report is a good report, in my judgment, as far as it goes, although it seems to me that it is too conservative, that it does not go far enough.

The University of Chicago last month sent out to all colleges in which recent Ph.D.'s from the University of Chicago were teaching, an information blank concerning recent doctors of philosophy engaged in university or college teaching, with the request that the administrative officers of such institutions report back to the University of Chicago the points of strength and points of weakness observed in the teaching of those recent Ph.D.'s, together with any suggestions for the improvement of graduate training resulting from observation of the teaching of these persons.

That seems to me to be one hundred per cent cooperation on the part of the University of Chicago with the program urged by this Association; and I in turn would urge those members of this Association who have received copies of this questionnaire, a very simple one, to cooperate to the full in giving the most careful estimates and suggestions possible with regard to the work of these new teachers.

At the December meeting of the American Association of University Professors, I ventured to point out, speaking really as Chairman of this Commission, that that Association, which is essentially the American Association of University and College Teachers, was the only major educational association which did not have a committee hard at work upon the improvement of college teaching, and suggested that that was a somewhat anomalous condition. I am glad to be able to report that since that

meeting the Council of that Association has decided to appoint a standing committee to study this special field.

Finally, as another move in the same field, although not related, as far as I know, to the previous report of this Commission, the Commissioner of Education of the United States has sent out, and doubtless most of you have received, an elaborate questionnaire, calling for information for a study of the aims and objectives of graduate instruction as related to the preparation of teachers for undergraduate colleges. It is a difficult questionnaire to fill out; and yet here again, in the interests of this matter of the improvement of college teaching, I venture to recommend, and indeed to urge, the fullest cooperation on the part of members of this Association.

It may be said, I think, that by no means entirely as the result of the earlier report of this Commission, but in considerable part as the result of that report, the movement for the improvement of college teaching, both with reference to the graduate training of prospective teachers, and with reference to the training of young instructors after they have come to our colleges, is making good headway. The Commission at this time has no further recommendations to make in this field, although I think it possible that the Commission may, in the course of the current year, ask for a more exact collection of information as to what the members of this Association are doing with reference to the in-service training of young instructors.

I should like now, Mr. President, to present the new part of our report, dealing with the enlistment of college teachers. This report is already in print, and by its distribution I shall be able to present it within the space of five minutes after it is once distributed.

[The following report was then distributed, and attention was called to its main points and recommendations. On motion the report was received and referred to the Committee on Resolutions.]

This Commission, as its title indicates, is concerned with two problems, the enlistment of college teachers, and the training of college teachers. Two years ago the Commission presented a report dealing with the second of these two problems.

The present report is concerned with the other problem, namely, the enlistment of college teachers.

The enlistment of prospective college teachers is far too important a matter to leave to chance or to undirected student initiative.

The profession of college teaching is second to none in its necessity for the common welfare, and—as most of us know of our own knowledge—it is rich in satisfactions.

Since this profession is necessary for the common welfare, it is obviously of prime importance that there should come steadily into it, from year to year, young men and women of high ability; and since, in addition to being necessary, it is rich in satisfaction, we need not hesitate to draw such men and women into it, even though we know that, like every other profession, it imposes limitation and sacrifice.

The question is not merely general: it is also practical and immediate. The first duty of a college president is the maintenance of a staff of good teachers; and the most active phase of this duty is the filling of vacancies. The endeavor to fill vacancies brings us face to face with the fact that the supply of good college teachers does not begin to be as large as it should be. We should therefore seek to bring into the profession far more college students of high potential teaching ability than are now entering it.

We should be better able to take constructive steps in this matter if we had more exact knowledge of the facts. The Commission proposes, therefore, in the first instance, a simple factual inquiry, designed to ascertain certain things with regard to the graduates of each college which is a member of this Association: first, the actual number of members of each of the last ten graduating classes who are engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the percentage of the class represented by this number; and, second, the actual number of persons in the upper quarter of each of the same ten classes who are engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the percentage of those in the upper quarter of the class represented by this number.

If this Association at this meeting adopts the present report, the Secretary of the Association will prepare blanks for use in such an inquiry, and will distribute them to the member colleges.

While we can presumably work to better advantage after we have the results of such an inquiry, we do not need to wait for such results to start a direct attack on the problem of the enlistment of college teachers.

The enlistment of college teachers means, in the main, the enlistment of college students, before they graduate from college, for the career of college teaching.

The graduate schools, to be sure, are not without their problems in this connection, and to these problems we shall refer briefly at the very end of this report; but most students in graduate schools have decided upon their professional career, and the enlistment problem is, in the main, as we have said, the problem of enlisting undergraduates.

How shall we do this? Certain specific plans and devices which may be properly and effectively employed will be mentioned below; but even these constitute only a secondary resource.

The only answer of primary and major significance is familiar and obvious: it is simply to make the teaching profession so attractive that the ablest students will naturally be drawn to enlist in it.

It must *be* attractive and it must *seem* attractive. It cannot be made to *seem* attractive unless it *is* attractive; for the profession of college teaching is under direct inspection by the college student day after day for four years, and you cannot possibly fool him into thinking that it is something which it is not. If it is attractive he will know it; and if it is unattractive he will know that.

The status of this profession with regard to vocational choice is different from that of any other profession. You can tell a student what you please about the law, or medicine, or business, and if he believes that you speak with authority he will listen with open mind, for these professions are not largely known to him. But you cannot tell him much about the profession of college teaching. He knows.

In so far, therefore, as the profession of college teaching is attractive, it has an advantage over other professions in the competition for student approval; in so far as it is unattractive, it is at a disadvantage as compared with other professions.

Our task is, then, to correct, not merely in appearance but in fact, those features of the academic life which are relatively unattractive, and to enhance those features of the academic life which are relatively attractive.

To discuss systematically the program just suggested would take us far beyond the bounds of the topics assigned to this Commission—into the whole range of our central administrative problems. Such a survey we cannot undertake; but we venture to present a brief discussion of those aspects of college teaching which seem to us to determine, most directly, the strength or the weakness of its vocational appeal.

A college man facing the choice of a profession seeks in that profession, in the main, six qualities: first, that it be highly interesting in itself; second, that the human relationships involved be stimulating and potentially cordial; third, that the work afford chance for freedom of thought and speech, and for initiative; fourth, that it afford chance for distinction; fifth, that it afford chance for service; sixth, that it give promise of financial competence as a basis for a happy family life. If college teaching is to appeal to the undergraduate, it must be such as to appeal in these six respects.

It must be highly interesting to those who carry it on. The teacher who teaches lifelessly and without originality—even though he teach accurately and conscientiously—is guilty of a double wrong: he is lessening the immediate understanding and achievement of the students who sit before him, and he is turning them aside from teaching as a profession. Who would want to do, all his life long, a thing for which those who do it do not seem really to care? On the other hand, the teacher who is possessed with the fascination of his theme, who brings some eager contribution of his own to the day's work, converts not only to a subject but to a profession.

Interest in the subject matter of teaching means, of course, interest in scholarship. The fundamental reason why the harvest of good college teachers is small is because the collegiate experience of the American undergraduate is not such as to exalt scholarship and the life of scholarship in his eyes.

This is the main thesis of Dean Woodbridge in his notable address on "The Supply of Adequately Trained University Teachers."¹ He says:

If we . . . ask why it is that the supply of really able teachers . . . is so inadequate, the answer is, I think, simple. Our system of education is not intended to produce them. In other words, in education our attention has not been given significantly to scholarship, but to something else, namely, to industry and alertness. Our system is designed to produce not a certain quality of mind, but a certain type of person, not a scholar who loves learning, but an American, alert and industrious, fitted to meet the demands of American life. . . . We have done reasonably well the thing we have been trying to do. . . . The state of the country's scholarship and learning is pretty much what we should expect it to be from the character of the education we have been giving to our people. Aiming at industry and alertness, we have largely succeeded in attaining them, so that the product of our education is on the average a person adaptable, quick, resourceful and dependable. But aiming at these virtues so predominantly, we have produced scholars only rarely and incidentally. So I repeat that the scarcity of adequately trained university teachers is due fundamentally to the fact that our system of education is not intended to produce them.

It is then our part as administrators to foster scholarly enthusiasm and originality in our faculties; and so to select our students, and so to order their collegiate experience, that the keen and durable satisfactions of scholarship may stand forth clearly in their sight.

The college student asks also of his to-be-chosen profession that the human relationships involved be stimulating

¹ In *Educational Problems in College and University*, ed. by J. L. Brumm, Ann Arbor, 1921, pp. 159-174.

and potentially cordial. The primary professional human relationships of the teacher, and those which the student continuously observes, are, of course, the teacher's relationships with his students. And the teacher, by the character of those relationships, draws men toward his own profession or repels them therefrom. The repeated sight of a man for whom students exist as a passive class rather than as responsive individuals tends to deter any youth from entering a career which appears to be cold and impersonal in its basic relationship. Acquaintance with a teacher who genuinely enjoys companionship with students in and out of the classroom has not only its unfailing immediate effect, but serves, beyond that, to encourage enlistment in a profession which to some men, at least, brings such obvious friendly satisfaction.

It is then our part as administrators to encourage that type of teaching which invites student responsiveness, and to facilitate, in every possible way, the companionship of faculty and students.

In the third place, the teaching profession, if it is to appeal to the undergraduate, must afford chance for freedom of thought and speech, and for initiative. If the student believes that his teachers are cowed by intellectual or religious tyranny of any sort, if the profession as he sees it is darkened by private or by statutory obscurantism, he will naturally turn his steps in some other direction. If, on the other hand, his teachers speak in an atmosphere of liberalism, he will be moved to cast his lot with them. Similarly he will shun a profession which seems to him marked by regimentation and by conformity to tradition; and he will turn to one which appears to respect and to welcome inventive suggestion and experimental activity.

It is then our part as administrators to maintain an atmosphere of academic freedom; and to give cordial and courteous consideration to educational initiative on the part of any faculty member or any faculty group.

In the fourth place, the teaching profession must offer the chance for distinction. This may be the inner and absolute distinction of fine teaching personality, which no

student body ever fails to recognize; or it may be distinction of a more visible and formal nature. Any publication by a member of the faculty which wins a place on library shelves or in the college bookstore makes its impression on student readers. There are many types of academic recognition which quickly permeate student consciousness, as for instance special support in a teaching project, or in co-operative research; or the chairmanship of a joint faculty-student committee; or a public address with administrative introduction; or administrative commendation of some other sort. Our highest formal honor, the honorary degree, might well be more often bestowed for distinguished success in the profession in whose values we so profoundly believe. It is a good thing, also, when professors who have won the right to be heard step from the cloister into the arena. John Dewey—to take but a single instance—in his exercise of political influence does more than say his weighty say: he enhances the dignity of his profession in the eyes of thousands of students.

It is then our part as administrators constantly, and in every possible way, to accord distinction to those of our teaching staff who merit it; to manifest interest in significant faculty publications while in process and when completed; and to encourage justifiable and dignified participation of faculty members in public life.

In the fifth place, the teaching profession must clearly offer chance for service. The idea of service has perhaps been overworked in public addresses to students in recent years, and they do not welcome discussion of this theme. But the instinct for service is just as deeply rooted and just as vigorous as ever in student consciousness; and in determining whether or not to enter a given profession students will be largely guided by its prospect of service-ability. The college environment which would best convince the college student that the teaching profession offers a notable chance for service is obviously an environment in which college teaching is actually carried on in that spirit. That spirit vaunteth not itself, neither doth

it analyze nor promote itself. If it is genuine, it is deep, and quiet, and contagious.

In the sixth place, the teaching profession must give promise of financial competence as a basis for happy family life. The typical college student does not have his eyes fixed upon the attainment of wealth as a major goal; but he does ask reasonable assurance that if he makes good in his chosen work he will earn enough to support a family, with margin enough for some measure of social freedom. This means, in terms of the appeal of the teaching profession, that if the college student comes in contact with faculty homes which seem to him below his own standard of decency and contentment and pleasantness, he will tend to avoid the profession which they represent; and that if, on the contrary, he has access to faculty homes which have a family life—no matter how simple—marked by basic comfort and by happiness, illumined with the light of the mind and not untouched with beauty, he will be strongly drawn to membership in such a community.

The making of such homes requires personal attitudes which we may perhaps encourage, though not control; and it requires adequate salaries, the provision of which lies squarely within the field of our responsibility.

The problem of the enlistment of students for the profession of college teaching reduces itself, essentially, to this: If the teaching profession seems attractive to the students who so closely and so constantly observe it, they will be drawn thereto—otherwise not; and it behooves us, therefore, to make the teaching profession, in very fact, more and more attractive.

To this, our one major thesis, we add six brief specific suggestions, of minor importance, bearing on the enlistment of students while they are still undergraduates.

The first is this: Many colleges offer courses, usually for the benefit of upper classmen, which survey the several vocations. Such courses are sometimes regular credit courses, involving assigned readings, discussions, and perhaps field work; sometimes they are merely series of lectures by invited guests. Our suggestion is simply that in

any such course the profession of college teaching be adequately presented.

Our second suggestion is that from time to time, perhaps once in a student generation, some faculty member to whom the students listen gladly be asked, on an appropriate public occasion—on Honors Day, for instance—to set forth the values of the academic life.

Our third suggestion is that at the period when major subjects are being chosen the advisors who are guiding the students in that choice be ready to suggest to able students the possibility of college teaching as a career; and that some special canvass of the ablest men be made in this connection by dean or president.

Our fourth suggestion is that professors who are directing the major work of juniors and seniors be encouraged to suggest college teaching as a profession to the ablest of the students concerned.

Our fifth suggestion is that there be prepared, under the auspices of this Association, a booklet designed for the benefit of undergraduates interested in the possibility of preparing for college teaching.

Our last suggestion is negative. It is that we are in honor bound to discourage from entering the profession any students who, though inclined to it, give no promise of becoming good teachers.

Thus far we have dealt with the enlistment of students while undergraduates. In brief conclusion we venture to touch upon the responsibilities of the graduate school, as we see them, in this connection.

First of all, and in general, the experience of graduate school life, as the first stage in the teacher's career, should be made attractive, in fact and in appearance. Provision of fellowships and scholarships is already generous, but that is not enough. The entire graduate school program needs humanization. It is typically, though not absolutely, true that while undergraduates are housed in college buildings, graduate students are left to find scattered shelters where they may, with the result that they lack the relative comfort, the companionship, and the sense of being a recog-

nized part of the institution, which go with undergraduate dormitory life. Furthermore, while it is true that the undergraduate colleges suffer today from too much extra-curricular interest and activity, it is a fair question whether the graduate school does not suffer today from too little extra-curricular interest and activity. Loneliness, narrowness, and poor physique are all too often characteristic of the graduate student.

The nature of living conditions and conditions of companionship in the graduate school is important, not merely because the existence of good or bad conditions is of course reported back by the graduate students to the colleges from which they come, but because those conditions are daily displayed before the undergraduate students of the university in question. If you ask the undergraduate student of a university whether he is going into college teaching, his answer, if the graduate conditions which he observes are ideal, might well be an enthusiastic affirmative; whereas, if the conditions are such as in fact they all too often are, his answer might be briefly and sharply negative.

When the prospective teacher has once arrived in the graduate school, the authorities of that school have, of course, the general responsibility of holding him true to his choice, by the reinforcement of the values which led him to make that choice. If however the graduate school authorities have sound reason to think that a given student, for lack of scholarly ability, or for any other cause, would not make a good college teacher, they owe it to the colleges which take their product to discourage such a person from entering the profession.

In the departments of the sciences it may not infrequently become the duty of the departmental head, if he is himself convinced of the values of college teaching, to help a good prospective teacher resist the appeal of commercial or industrial opportunity. It is of course highly desirable that such positions should be well filled—but it is not desirable that their filling should unduly deplete the stock of good future professors in the field of science.

Finally, the graduate student's esteem for the profession of teaching will of course be enhanced—and thereby, through him, the esteem of younger men whom he may influence—when the graduate school itself more fully recognizes the implication of the facts that its students are, in general, preparing for college teaching, and that college teaching is indeed a profession: a profession which glories centrally and rightly in that scholarship which the graduate schools have exalted, and should ever exalt, but a profession so beset with professional difficulties, so hampered by professional needs, so critically important in its professional responsibilities, and so rich in its professional opportunities that its novices deserve—and would in service and in gratitude repay—the development of a plan of training which shall contemplate the fullness of the professional experience to which they go.

STANLEY BALDWIN AT ST. ANDREW'S UNIVERSITY

There is something to be prized more than learning during undergraduate years, for above it must be placed "the constant clash of personality, the interchange of ideas, the questionings, the testing of opinion, the growth of knowledge of human nature, all those things that no books can give and that can only be obtained by that free intercourse which is most natural and most easy in the elastic formative years of undergraduate life." So long as our colleges and universities provide these democracies in little, they may fail here and there in strictly educational theory and practice, but at any rate they are supplying the best kind of training for life and for the active duties of citizenship. —Stanley Baldwin as reported in *The New York Times*.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP

HENRY M. WRISTON, CHAIRMAN

PRESIDENT OF LAWRENCE COLLEGE

THE previous report has dealt with the training and the enlistment of college teachers. The Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship is concerned with the maintenance of these teachers upon a level of their highest potential personal and scholastic efficiency.

We all tend to assume that a person well trained and well employed will remain a valuable factor in the life of the institution. Those considerations are indeed of the first importance. Yet the experience of industry and our own experience indicate with perfect definiteness that good training and selective employment do not guarantee continued good work. Changes take place—and not only in the instructional efficiency but in the actual personality of the teacher. Hence his effectiveness as a scholar, as an instructor, and as a personal force fluctuates actively and sometimes violently. A careful study of the teaching of chemistry in a large number of land grant colleges revealed an apparent decline in teaching effectiveness with the passing years, and some of the best teaching was done by those newly trained and freshly enlisted. The values associated with experience were in many cases more than offset by losses in other respects.

This is but one illustration of the fact that the college, like industry, sometimes faces a problem of premature obsolescence. All of us are acquainted with men in middle life, who upon entering the colleges showed much promise, whose health is sound, but who nevertheless, have lost their *drive*. Their past services do not admit of their being dropped, their present values do not justify their academic positions. What to do with them?

We have recognized the personnel problem as it has to do with the developing life of the students, whereas our emphases with the teacher are upon training and competence rather than upon continuing development. We lay great emphasis upon teaching power. Yet we have objective evidence and the evidence of our

own observation to assure us that many lose in teaching power during their continuance with our institutions.

We have come, with the guidance of standardizing agencies, to require certain advanced degrees, the attainment of which is supposed to involve research activities. Yet a shocking percentage never go on with research after receiving the degrees, and never become productive scholars. The degree requirements include knowledge of foreign languages. Again a shockingly large percentage do not use these languages after receiving the degree, and, consequently, do not require their students to use them. Thus undergraduate linguistic requirements tend to be academic hurdles rather than tools for use.

The fault lies partly in the graduate schools which have given the trappings and the suits of scholarship to men and women who never were and never will be scholars. Partly the fault is with individuals who enter a learned profession with no passion for learning.

Partly, however, (and it is with this that our Commission is concerned) it is our own fault. Sometimes we require too much teaching, and teaching over too wide a range of subjects. A man may be so engrossed with mere class-room activities that his teaching becomes stale and lifeless. "The mere teacher of average intelligence plays out before he reaches the age of fifty, for by that time he has fallen back a quarter of a century in his knowledge, and thus has no longer the goods to deliver to the oncoming generation." (Quoted by Professor Tufts in Kent's *Higher Education in America*.) Starting as a good teacher, he may end as a poor one.

The constant contact with immature minds constitutes a real danger to the profession. The competition is always unequal and is made the more so by the remnants of disciplinary authority vested in the professor. This is, of course, particularly true in colleges, as distinguished from universities, because of the absence of somewhat more mature graduate students. Teaching over the same field again and again invites underpreparation, encourages a tendency to bluff. People going into dangerous professions must develop powers of resistance. The teacher must develop resistance by setting for himself intellectual tasks which demand all his powers. Such tasks require special equipment.

Again, there are administrative duties. The college should be a democratic society of scholars. But not infrequently the members of the faculty have laid upon them committee work which is really administrative in character. Nearly every college has its counselling or advisory system. Contacts with students are of the essence of college teaching, but some spend so much time in contacts and in performing the other functions of the college that they do not keep up to date—so they have less and less to give intellectually. Mere geniality, mere kindness—even high character,—are not enough. The teacher should be intellectually alive, up-to-date, taking his morning plunge into the flowing stream of knowledge. If the students do not respect his intellectual contributions, they will in due time associate the poverty of his academic offerings with his attempts at character training.

Finally, the typical college teacher carries a shocking burden of routine. He is not furnished with and cannot afford to employ adequate secretarial or clerical help. He must write by hand or do his own typing, and, in short, spend hours and hours at tasks which a girl could do very much better. He will tend to fall into slow and inefficient habits of doing routine tasks; he will hesitate to delegate even small duties. Only, as Abraham Flexner fittingly remarks, “in fragments of time snatched from routine duties” does he find opportunity to keep abreast of his field,—much less make original contributions to scholarship.

This Commission is turning its thought with this background in mind to the habits of reading engendered within the college faculties by the size of the library appropriations, by the policies governing library purchases, by the load of teaching, administrative work, and routine upon professors, by the desirability and necessity of student contacts, and by the location of the institutions themselves.

It is manifest that the teacher who tends to use only textbooks written for students is not being developed. His mind is in contact with only the generalizations and simplifications designed for immaturity. He ought, on the other hand, to be living with the creative spirits within his field, as their writings appear in the journals and in works of scholarly significance, and not only in English but in the foreign languages as well.

The Commission, therefore, wishes to study the reading habits of professors in a representative group of colleges. It has a direct relationship to the "Intellectual Life Project" but seeks data upon the subject in a somewhat more objective way than has yet been suggested. So far as we know, it has not been considered by any other investigation, and is not involved in the current study of college libraries by the Carnegie Corporation. We wish to discover the amount, the sources and the character of the material read by instructors in typical departments in a group of colleges, those institutions to represent institutions of different size and resources, and of different location with reference to large libraries from which they may borrow. This will give us some objective evidence as to what extent college instructors read general contemporary literature, and their professional literature, what differences appear in the reading habits of instructors in various departments, and to what extent faculty reading is related to the number and character of the annual accessions to the college library.

We are eager to know the relations between the extent and character of the reading done by instructors in different colleges and the differences in the intellectual life of the college as reflected in the number of alumni entering graduate schools and otherwise.

On behalf of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship, I move the reference of this report to the Committee on Resolutions, with the request that the report be approved and that the project be referred to the Executive Committee with a recommendation for favorable action if the money can be secured. (The motion was seconded and carried).

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY, CHAIRMAN
TRUSTEE OF BATES COLLEGE

COMMENTS ON RECENT FINANCIAL CONDITIONS

THE last eighteen months have tried the souls of men who are responsible for the administration of funds either for themselves or for others. Values have depreciated and in some instances have threatened wholly to disappear.

Although this period of stress seems extreme, yet it is not unprecedented nor altogether novel. There have been outstanding depressions and panics in the history of our country as bad, or even worse than this. The dates of 1837, 1857 and 1873 mark the collapse of financial structures and the loss of values which seemed to threaten the very foundations of our American life and culture. Disturbances of lesser severity have recurred in almost periodic cycles, so definite in their swing that certain men expect them, foresee them, plan for them and speak of them, practically as matters of course.

The primary cause of these ups and downs in values is psychological, revealing itself in mass-action causing far-reaching economic changes. When times are good, when business prospers, when wages are high and there is employment for all, when income rolls in freely and men have money to spend, then everybody buys and buys, every factory and industry runs at full production-capacity, credits expand and a veritable orgy of extravagance and luxury follows. Inevitably the day of reckoning comes. The first cautious and sound visioned creditors call for pay; then others must have cash in settlement; debtors seek for more or for continued credit; credit is refused; and then the whole structure of unsound and speculative credit tumbles; cash must be had; stocks, bonds and other securities must be sold; and values disappear.

After the debacle, then the pendulum swings again in the opposite direction. Everybody becomes thrifty and prudent; everybody saves, even those who do not need to save; and

through a period of hard times, of careful thinking and planning, of cautious action, values become stabilized, business recovers, industry begins to prosper, wages increase, incomes once more roll in, prosperity on a national scale once more flourishes; and then, once more the people turn to luxury and extravagance, to a period of spending, speculation and undue credit-expansion; and after that recur the collapse, the panic and the depression.

Wars, social disorders, unusual taxation, tariff-restrictions which limit markets, national corruption, communal waste, mechanization of industry and other economic disturbances may accentuate and vary these trends and swings of the financial pendulum, but they are primarily due to the primitive tendency of people to become improvident in the midst of prosperity and to become prudent and cautious only in times of adversity.

In very recent years and months our American people have been urged on by a false economic philosophy to continue the orgy of spending. They have been assured that there is no proverbial "rainy day" which should be provided for, that the "rainy day" is a myth and a bugbear of the past, that accident insurance, unemployment insurance, old age insurance, and death benefits and "doles" of various kinds, take away all necessity of saving; they have been told that to buy luxuries for self is an act of benevolence for others, that by spending they become altruistic and promote prosperity; they have been urged to buy on the instalment plan, mortgaging future wages for a present satisfaction. Government officials and even educators have spoken to the public in terms of derision of "riotous saving."

Certainly in a period of depression and after such a period, there are lessons to be learned, which lie closely at hand:—

There is little reason for becoming panic-stricken. Such things have happened before. He who remains calm and self-possessed may the more easily see the way out.

Intrinsic values have not disappeared; chiefly relative values and ratios have been altered.

Institutions are essentially buyers of income rather than dealers in capital values, and therefore, should not concern themselves unduly with the inevitable fluctuations in security price levels.

RECENT CAUTIONS IN THE USE OF ANNUITY AGREEMENTS

On November 17, 1930, a conference was held at Atlantic City, consisting of sixty persons, who examined principles involved and re-evaluated the use of annuity agreements.

In the last five years, including 1929, as shown by a study made by Mr. Paul C. Cassat, Comptroller of Vassar College, eighty-nine colleges have written annuity agreements covering the receipt of \$15,000,000. In the same five-year period, forty-four religious organizations have written annuity agreements involving nearly \$11,000,000. The colleges are much more conservative in writing annuity agreements than are religious organizations.

As a rule the colleges agree to pay the *net earnings* of the sum received so long as the annuitant lives, rather than a specified amount in excess of the earnings. This method is essentially the acceptance of a living trust. It involves few risks, it makes the annuity gift a gift in its entirety and benefits the annuitant through relieving him of care and responsibility and by settling his estate, at least to the extent of this gift, while he is living.

The papers presented at this conference have been published by the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters and are well worthy of careful attention by those using annuity agreements as a method of building up endowments.*

CONTINGENT ENDOWMENT TRUST

Mr. Daniel S. Remsen, author of *The Preparation of Wills and Trusts*, *Post-Mortem Use of Wealth*, and *The Uniform Trust for Public Uses*, has drafted a form of contingent endowment trust which embodies the following features of importance to college administrators:—

An initial gift may be placed in the hands of a trustee for the benefit of a college in general or for specified departments and purposes.

This trust may be a private trust for the benefit of the person who makes it or for some person named by him, for a period of years or for life, the income to be paid to the trustor or to the person designated by him.

* See the *Bulletin* December, 1930, pp. 473-476, for a summary of some statements made at this conference, particularly in the realm of cautions.

When the trust period has been reached at the time of death or limiting date stated in the document, then the trust becomes available for the college named as beneficiary, or for the purpose or department of the college as specified.

In the meantime the trust document provides that other persons may join under the same instrument with the same trustee, or another trustee perhaps in another city, using the same instrument, creating a private trust as in the former case which ultimately becomes a trust for the benefit of the college.

These trusts, one or several, may all be contingent upon the raising or the pledging of other sums and the creation of other trusts so as to aggregate on or before a certain date, a certain specified amount, running up, it may be, into several millions of dollars.

A committee of persons named will determine, as the date for the culmination of the campaign approaches, whether or not various trusts in view of their contingent provisions, and various pledges in view of their uncertainties, are nevertheless sufficiently definite and collectible to be regarded as assured and then to be reckoned toward the total of the amount sought.

If and when the committee pronounces various trusts, pledges and donations as valid and collectible, the campaign then becomes completed so far as solicitation is concerned, and awaits the expiration of time for maturing of obligations.

This brief and scant description scarcely does justice to the plan, but for lack of time for fuller presentation should now suffice. This plan has been printed in full in the *Bulletin* of December, 1930, and the legal document which embodies it has been published as No. 33 in the Wise Public Giving Series of the Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters.

SUMMARY OF FIELDS

The committee has prepared a statement of too great length to justify entire presentation at this time. The statement consists of definitions and descriptions of methods for obtaining and administering funds, including sub-titles like the following:—Who may hold funds as trustees; Sources from which funds are drawn; Prerequisites for the financial success of a college; The self-scrutiny of a college; Forms of Giving includ-

ing (1) the direct and absolute gift, (2) living trusts, (3) annuity agreements, (4) bequests by life insurance, (5) bequests by last will and testament; Certain comments upon financial drives and certain conclusions which are emerging out of the experience of large organizations in raising endowments and in handling trust funds.

Your Commission requests that it be permitted to publish this section of its report in a separate pamphlet, if so approved and advised by the Executive Committee.

IS A UNITED INVESTMENT POLICY POSSIBLE?

For a number of years the question in one form or another has been in the minds of some thoughtful men in the field of charity and education, whether their organizations might pool their funds, in whole or in part, and some of their activities, in making investments. At one time the question assumed this form:—Could these educational and charitable organizations afford to pay for a committee of men, perhaps three in number, who should devote their time exclusively to the study of securities and their relative values, accumulating information which might be drawn upon by member institutions when about to buy securities or sell or exchange them? A special task of this committee would be to anticipate, as far as wisdom can foresee radical changes impending, such as that which at one time took value out of trolley lines and securities which represented them and severely affected railroads and their earnings, as came to pass, when the automobile began to be common.

The question has assumed this form:—Could educational institutions combine in such a way as to command sums of money, waiting for investment, sufficiently large to give them particular entrance into profitable underwritings and the early offerings of bond issues?

A more practical form of inquiry has recently emerged:—Can the colleges, through the medium of the Association of American Colleges or its Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds, or some other special agency set up for the purpose, purchase the expert advice and information of one of the great research and statistical organizations of the country in the field of investment, so that information which indicated impending changes in

values might be reported to the member institutions and they be prepared thereby for action which they independently might wish to take?

This last question may be put in concrete terms, as follows:— If an institution or a group of institutions, having 10 millions of dollars in bonds, secured the advice and information of expert specialists, they could do it at a cost of almost 1.2% per year of the income of 10 millions of dollars. This means that presumptively 10 millions of dollars will earn \$500,000 a year. For approximately \$6,000 a year, an outstanding corporation specializing in the field of investments, would carry the list of investments represented by the \$10,000,000, keeping them constantly in mind, studying and watching values and fluctuations, and would send information, the result of study and research, to a central office from which this information could be distributed to the institutions owning special securities which might be the subject of a report. This means for every dollar of investment income a charge of 1.2 cents or a net yield of .988 cents. In case the investment values were more than 10 millions of dollars, running up, as they well might, into hundreds of millions, the cost would be relatively less and might be reduced to an insignificant fraction of one per cent upon the income accruing.

Of course the fundamental practical question is, would such a service be of value to the colleges and other charitable organizations of the country which desired to combine in the creation of an agency to distribute the information, and are there organizations which wish to set up the agency for such distribution?

Does, for example, the Association of American Colleges wish its Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds to make more careful inquiry as to the possibility of securing such services?

APPROVED PRINCIPLES EMERGING

More and more people wish to give. They are able to give larger amounts. They do not wish to be coerced, or to be cajoled into giving. They welcome the thinking and the service which is disinterested and statesmanlike.

It is a fatal policy to try to make all people give in the same way. Methods of giving need to be known and understood, and

to be explained, and to be compared, with patience and with clarity. The method which best fits the giver needs to reach the giver's attention so that the giver may recognize it and its fitness to his situation.

There is a growing consciousness that the wisdom of today is not adequate for all time and that requirements imposed today must be subject to adaptation and change as conditions in the future change. In other words, givers-of-the-long-reach believe in posthumous discretion and desire to make provision for it as soon as they discover how best it can be done.

In many minds the thought is taking positive shape that it is not wise to make a charitable organization its own trustee. The conviction is becoming clear that in the administration of permanent funds in trust for charity two distinct functions are involved: One is the administration of funds by way of custody, investment and security; this is the function of financial experts, and is best in the hands of trust companies or banks having fiduciary powers. The other function is the distribution and the expenditure of income of the funds in the specific charity and should be in the hands of experts in this line. Even though incorporated charitable organizations hitherto have usually been given powers to perform both of these functions, yet not a few times has it been discovered that they are not well qualified for both tasks, notwithstanding the presence of persons regarded as experts in each field on their boards.

It is becoming obvious to many minds that, if charitable organizations are to make greater use in the future of corporate fiduciaries, they should have for use a standard, uniform trust agreement, inasmuch as many of these charitable organizations have their supporters, have branches and have work in many places throughout the country, so that wherever they are, wherever their work and their supporters may be, local trustees may serve their purposes by using a uniform agreement, understood and approved by all.

The conviction is arising in many minds that permanent, charitable funds—those which continue perpetually—may become at some later date hindrances rather than helps to charity because they may perpetuate useless and obstructive methods and institutions which ought in reality to be borne by future

generations. The conviction, therefore, has shaped up in many minds that provision should be made, when trusts are set up, for their final distribution and the expenditure of the principal as well as the income of endowments and trust funds. This may be accomplished by limiting the trust to a certain number of years at the termination of which the principal shall all be distributed, or, preferably by giving the trustees discretion to expend a certain percentage of the principal after the passage of a certain number of years and at recurring intervals until it may all have been disbursed.

Charitable organizations are not asking for free service from those who serve them. They may have done so in the past. They may be thought of as doing so now; some may even do it. But the tendency is very clear and very striking that all they ask for is a fair charge for a fair service, and they are willing to pay it. They are almoners of men's gifts; they do not propose to impress men into service.

The highest-minded men, both amongst those who administer charities and amongst those who support charities, are requiring of themselves and are desiring from others clear, open, transparent ethical standards and procedures, so that whether one "runs" he may "read," or whether one sits down and makes a careful investigation, he will discover, through and through, naught but honesty and integrity. People who deal in terms of endowments, permanent funds and trusts know that only those things can endure the testing of time which are built on a sound foundation.

A PENDING CONFERENCE

The Committee on Financial and Fiduciary Matters centering in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America but representing practically every kind of large and nationally organized charity,—religious, educational and philanthropic,—will hold its Fourth Biennial Conference March 17-19, 1931, in the Hotel Chalfonte, Atlantic City, N. J. The subjects then to be considered include those of special interest to your Commission, which urges as many members of the Association to send representatives as possible.

REPORT OF THE COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS

FRANK L McVEY, CHAIRMAN

PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

A SECOND inquiry was sent to the colleges of the country from the office of this Association by the Commission, asking them what surveys or studies of college problems were made during 1929-30. In 112 institutions surveys of some kind were undertaken during the year 1929-30. Seventy-one different departmental studies or surveys were made. One hundred and seventy-three institutions indicated that future surveys either of the institution or departments were in mind, and 236 stated that there were no surveys or studies either now or in the future in contemplation. Last year 219 institutions reported that there was some sort of survey being undertaken by them or for them. Undoubtedly many of these are now completed so that the interest in surveys seems to have dropped off.

In several institutions the comments received indicated that it was the purpose of the institution to carry on continuous study of the workings of the institution. That has been done in several instances, as in the case of the University of Southern California, the University of Minnesota, the University of Michigan, and in a smaller degree at Louisiana State University and Antioch College. These continuous surveys are really after all not surveys but studies of particular problems which arise in the institution. Such studies, however, cannot result effectively unless provision is made for the employment of a well-trained person to carry on work over a period of time. In fact, one of the real needs of institutions is an educational advisor and diagnostician who will have a research attitude toward problems that are up for consideration.

The survey of all the Land Grant Colleges, undertaken by the United States Office of Education, has been completed and the results published in two volumes which are now available. The Pennsylvania survey of the colleges and secondary schools of that state has been completed and part of the results published. There are two notable group surveys, one being made for the

Methodist Episcopal Church and the other on "Quaker Education in America" for the organization known as the Five Years Meeting of Friends. A state survey has been made in Maryland and some progress has been made on the Missouri survey.

Such a summary gives some idea of what is happening in the survey of educational institutions on the college level. Our figures show considerable activity but the value of these surveys to this Association is practically nothing unless the surveys are put in published form or made available to the members of this Association. It would be well, in the opinion of the Commission, to select a number of these surveys as worthy of study and then to summarize the results of the surveys so as to make such results available to the Association. At the present time it may be said that the enumeration of figures about the number of surveys is interesting but contains no particular power or suggestion relative to the betterment of educational procedure. Consequently, it is desirable to make summaries of the results of the best of the present surveys for the benefit of the Association. The Commission recommends that this be done.

WHOEVER HEARD?

Whoever heard of a meeting of college alumni to improve the library facilities? Whoever heard of a conference of alumni on the research problems of a university? Whoever heard of a meeting of alumni that confined its discussions largely to the promotion of the moral and ethical and spiritual welfare of the student body? Whoever heard of a meeting of alumni whose primary purpose was that of improving scholarship within the institution? And yet these are the things that constitute the sole excuse for a college or a university.—*Lotus D. Coffman.*

REPORT OF PROGRESS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARD REPORTS FOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

DONALD J. COWLING

PRESIDENT OF CARLETON COLLEGE

TWO years ago, at the meeting of the Association in Chattanooga, action was taken authorizing the appointment of a committee to prepare standard forms for financial and statistical reports adapted for general use by institutions affiliated with the Association. The Council of Church Boards of Education took similar action and authorized the same committee to represent them. This committee was appointed at a meeting of the Executive Committee of this Association in March, 1929.

In May, 1929, Mr. A. J. Klein, then chief of the Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education, invited the Association of University and College Business Officers of the Western States to appoint two representatives to serve on a committee, sponsored by the United States Office of Education, which should also include representatives of the Eastern and Southern Associations of Business Officers. Learning of this action, I wrote Dr. Klein in October, 1929, suggesting that the two committees work together. As a result, representatives of both committees met in Dr. Klein's office in Washington on March 24, 1930, and agreed to merge the work of the two committees under the title, "National Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning." This plan had been previously approved by Dr. Kelly on behalf of our Association and the Council of Church Boards of Education.

It was voted to add two representatives of the Business Officers of Colleges and Universities of the Pacific Coast, a representative of the American Association of Teachers Colleges, and one from the National Association of Collegiate Registrars. Commissioner Cooper expressed the willingness of the United States Office of Education to cooperate in the undertaking and to adopt the findings of the Committee as a basis for its own work, providing the recommendations agreed upon are adopted by a sufficient number of institutions.

The Committee as finally organized was composed of sixteen members representing all sections of the country and all types and sizes of institutions, as follows:

Representing the Association of American Colleges and the Council of Church Boards of Education:

President D. J. Cowling, Carleton College
 Dr. E. S. Evenden, Teachers College, Columbia University*
 J. C. Christensen, Assistant Secretary and Purchasing Agent, University of Michigan
 George C. Wintringer, Comptroller, Princeton University
 Professor F. W. Reeves, University of Chicago
 President George F. Zook, University of Akron
 President E. E. Rall, North Central College

Representing the Association of University and College Business Officers of the Eastern States:

W. O. Miller, Comptroller, University of Pennsylvania
 G. S. Rupp, Auditor, University of Pittsburgh

Representing the Southern Educational Buyers and Business Officers Association:

G. H. Mew, Treasurer, Emory University
 F. L. Jackson, Treasurer, Davidson College

Representing the Association of University and College Business Officers of the Western States:

C. E. Steeb, Business Manager, Ohio State University
 Lloyd Morey, Comptroller, University of Illinois

Representing the Business Officers of Pacific Coast Universities and Colleges:

Andrew Comrie, Auditor, University of Oregon
 E. S. Erwin, Auditor, Stanford University

Representing the National Association of Collegiate Registrars:

R. M. West, Registrar, University of Minnesota

Mr. Lloyd Morey, Comptroller of the University of Illinois, was elected Chairman, Mr. F. L. Jackson, Treasurer of Davidson College, Vice-Chairman, Mr. G. H. Mew, Treasurer of Emory University, Secretary, and Mr. George C. Wintringer, Comptroller of Princeton University, Treasurer. These four officers and myself were authorized to act as an Executive Committee.

* Also representing the American Association of Teachers Colleges.

A detailed budget of the probable expenses was prepared and, with the consent of the presidents of the various organizations represented in the Committee, was submitted to the General Education Board, of New York. Mr. Trevor Arnett, President of the Board, who has probably exerted a wider influence for sound accounting methods in American colleges and universities than any one else, became interested at once and soon made available adequate funds for the work of the Committee.

The Committee voted to undertake first the preparation of a standard form of annual financial report, leaving for later study the question of methods of classification of statistical data.

The United States Office of Education undertook to assemble as far as possible financial reports from all American institutions of higher learning. There are 969 four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Reports were received from 363; 156 of these reports were carefully analyzed during the summer, for the most part by Mr. T. L. Hungate, Auditor of Teachers College, Columbia University.

If any one doubted the need for the work of this Committee, he would doubtless be convinced by the results disclosed by this study of these 156 representative reports now printed as a bulletin.

The following paragraphs from a summary of this study made by the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Morey, indicate some of the unsatisfactory conditions found:

The medium and small size institutions in many cases issue no reports or only very incomplete and imperfect ones. The study also indicates a large number of vital shortcomings in the accounting systems and reports of many institutions. For example, of the 156 institutions studied, thirty seven were unable to present a balance sheet or statement of their financial condition. . . Of the balance sheets presented, twenty-six are not subdivided into balanced groups of accounts such as current funds, endowment funds, plant assets, an arrangement which is considered by all authorities on the subject an essential feature of the report of an educational institution. . . In fifty-nine institutions of the group examined, only thirteen presented in one summary a complete exhibit of the financial transactions for the year. In fifty-nine institutions the report covered the current income and expenditures only, and gave no account of

receipts and expenditures for extension of plant. In eleven institutions whose reports indicated that they possess endowment funds, the assets of these funds were not ascertainable, suggesting that they might have been partially used or hypothecated to meet deficits of current operating expense or used for the construction of educational buildings.

Mr. Morey goes on to point out the surprising lack of uniformity in terminology. For example, thirty-one different titles are used in referring to expenditures for *instruction*, and fourteen in connection with *research*, twenty-one for the operation and maintenance of the *physical plant*, and seventeen for its *extension*.

Mr. Morey continues,

Another serious difficulty revealed, is the fact that expenditures for the same purpose are not classified in the same way in the different institutions. An analysis of a number of items indicated that the same item of expense would be classified in as many as seven different ways in various institutions. . . Thus it becomes impossible to determine with any degree of accuracy the comparative sums expended by various institutions for the same purpose.

The Committee at its first meeting recognized the necessity of formulating certain fundamental principles to be followed in the preparation of financial statements. Just what these principles are does not clearly appear from the reports examined, nor are the members of the Committee themselves in unanimous agreement as to many of the principles to be followed.

All agree that the balance sheet should indicate the total assets and liabilities of the institution classified by funds, and that this classification should include at least three sections indicating funds for (1) current purposes, (2) endowment and (3) plant. The Committee has also agreed that student loan funds should be indicated in a separate section. I personally favor a separate section also for scholarship funds, but this has not been approved by the Committee, chiefly for the reason that there seems to be a tendency to merge the investments representing these funds in a pool with other endowment investment.

I have also favored for many years accounting for depreciation and charging to current educational operations an amount representing the actual deterioration of educational buildings

and equipment. The Committee definitely decided not to recommend this practice, largely because it involves setting up funded reserves which state institutions especially can never be persuaded to do. The recommendation of the Committee is that "plant assets should be carried at cost until they are disposed of, at which time they should be removed from the accounts."

Another point concerning which there has been a difference of opinion is the handling of "annuity funds." I strongly favor keeping these funds in an account entirely by themselves and listing them separately on the balance sheet in respect to both assets and liabilities. Several members of the Committee do not regard this as important and the tentative recommendation is to group annuity funds with so-called "Suspense Funds." I am still hoping that the final recommendation will be to keep them entirely separate.

I have referred to these items merely as illustrations of the difficulty of coming to a common agreement. It is obvious that many of us will have to give up some of our pet ideas if we are to come to reasonably uniform practices in presenting our financial affairs to the public. The science of accounting, so far as educational institutions are concerned, is still in the making. and there is much for all of us to learn.

On the other hand, the Committee recognizes that considerable progress has been made, and hopes to be able to suggest a form of report that will be based on sound principles and will embody the best features of existing practice.

Such a standard form should do much to simplify the problem of preparing reports for individual institutions, will enable college officers more readily to furnish information desired by the United States Office of Education and other educational agencies, will make possible comparative educational studies not possible on the basis of existing reports, and will enable the public more easily to understand our financial operations, thus creating greater interest, confidence and support.

ART AND THE COLLEGE

LORADO TAFT

LADIES and Gentlemen: One of our great writers has said that "Art is the ark of the covenant in which all ideals of beauty and excellence are carried before the people." I like that expression, and it is because I believe in it that I am here tonight. But another wise man, perhaps a little more cynical, has observed that with most of us the chief preoccupation of life is its continuance. In other words, we are so occupied in trying to make a living that many of us, at least, forget to make a life.

These thoughts come to me constantly, as they do to all of you who are engaged in educational work, and I sometimes find myself asking, What, after all, are we on earth for?

I ask it of you but I do not expect an answer. It is merely a rhetorical question.

I used to expect an answer. I have asked it many a time at high schools. They are the wisest of all groups, (laughter) and yet those young people are wiser than I imagined. They don't know, and they know that they don't know, and that is the beginning of all wisdom. No man is wise enough to tell us today. It was different when I was a boy. The catechism told us very explicitly and that satisfied us, but even the preachers are learning, (laughter) and today all is mystery. We know not whence we come nor whither we go; we can only guess and hope and discuss; but no man is perfectly sure.

It would be a horrible farce, a terrible tragedy, if we did not believe that we are making progress. That conviction depends a good deal on one's temperament. I am one of those who believe that we are making progress, although on the lines that I am particularly interested in, we shall never catch up with our friends, the Greeks. But, after all, the world, we believe, is gaining a little.

How would you measure progress? That is where we differ. Each individual has his ideas of progress and of what are the really significant things of life.

As I attempt to be an artist, I think of the gain in the world's beauty, those little accretions, those little inheritances that come

down from generation to generation, swelling the great possessions of the race. Here and there a man filled with emotion, inspired by some wonderful experience, makes a record of it, and leaves it behind, and we "enter into his labors." Once it was a pilgrim travelling along a dusty road; at nightfall he lay down and dreamed of the gates of Heaven opened, of a procession of angels "ascending and descending." Rising in the morning, all tremulous with this new exaltation, he set up a stone to mark that spot. That is what these achievements are. They are the milestones, the records, the memorials of great emotions that men have felt.

Of course, in order to do this satisfactorily, one must have a certain skill and technique, and whole generations of men are occupied simply in the five-finger exercises in order that someone later may accomplish a great thing and leave it behind.

Walt Whitman wrote, "To have great poets, you must have great audiences, too."

Another has said; "Great art demands passionate appreciation."

Rather paradoxical, rather puzzling is it not in these days, in a land which has had neither art nor appreciation? We have the capacity for great achievements, but until recent times we have been deficient in both factors. I am reminded of the old conundrum, "Which came first, the hen or the egg?" That has never been decided in the laboratories of science any more than around the grocery store stove. The discussion goes on, but I am sure of one thing, we can not start a successful poultry farm with neither hens nor eggs.

Some twelve years ago many of us had a great experience in our lives. Four "survivors" united at table today talking of the great events which followed the Armistice abroad. We were all over there, trying, in high positions and in low, to help those boys. I said just now to John Erskine, and he corroborated the fact, that in many ways our lives began at that moment. I think it was one of the greatest, most illuminating events in the lives of those who participated.

I did not get over in time to be a "hero." I must insist, however, that I offered myself, but I was a little too bald, or had high blood pressure, or something. Anyway they would not let

me go until after the Armistice. Then came the thrilling call, "Fifty more lecturers and entertainers needed." (Laughter) I knew I was not very entertaining, but I have ordinarily a big voice, and that makes a lecturer. (Laughter)

I had lived five years in France as an art student, and I loved the country, and I loved the people, and had some notion of what they mean in the story of civilization.

With a glad heart I went over to share my little possessions with our boys,—and that is where the illumination began. My first three months I travelled here and there, sent out by the "Y" to talk to the young men in their camps. I had lectured a good deal already and thought that I knew how. If time permitted I would tell you what happened.

Let me explain parenthetically that when I first settled in Chicago, nobody wanted my art. But the women's clubs—"God bless them"—wanted to hear about art, (laughter) and so I became that anomaly in natural history, the talking artist. Like Spartacus, "I was not always thus." I make this as an explanation, not an apology.

I had always talked to audiences that had gathered to hear me, and here I had the experience of talking to an audience that had not gathered to hear me. In those "Y" huts, the boys had come because it was cold and wet outside. They looked at me with curiosity, which shortly became indifference. They would yawn in my face. It was a very novel experience.

I asked myself, Why are they not interested in what interests me so much? In the things which come nearest to explaining life itself? This thought had come to me when we believed that Rheims was destroyed, and when we heard that the Germans were approaching Amiens. If two of the five greatest cathedrals of France are to be swept off the earth, what does it mean to civilization? That whole generations of mankind are to be left without a record; that men have lived and toiled and created—and then the whole thing is to be wiped away again. It enforced in my mind the thought that such treasures are all that can be left behind. "All passes, art alone remains." Back in the old days I find two little countries filling the whole horizon of the past: the Holy Land, as we call it, and Greece. They loom large because they had ideals of beauty and created things that have

been saved by reason of their beauty. They created, and we thank them for their gifts to humanity. Nevertheless it is the business of war to destroy all that is most precious.

Over and over I asked myself, How did the boys get that way? How was it that they were not interested in these things which mean so much to me? I began to understand when it was reported that 25 per cent of those boys were practically illiterate. Our census tells us six per cent, I believe; the exemption boards announced 25 per cent.

I made that statement in public several times. It has been challenged, and I took it up with Washington, and I found that the exemption boards put them to a real test. When they take the census in some distant places, like the Tennessee mountains, the agent would ask how many children they had, and whether they could all read and write; "Uh huh," and so it goes. But the exemption board asked them to read and asked them to write, and if they could not do so to any advantage to themselves or any one else, they were put down as illiterate.

That explained a great deal. Do not imagine that I disliked those boys. I learned to love them, and later I had the experience of meeting our more scholarly young men, where there were gathered together eight or ten thousand of them—graduates of high school. They knew at least what country they were in. The difference between them and the average doughboy was as the difference between daylight and the darkness of night.

I remember one place where the boys sat looking at me with glassy eyes; I heard that they were very hard to manage. There I met a fine motherly lady, an American, who made it her business to go out in the evening and round them up before they got into too much trouble. The boys used to hiccough their apologies to her and say they got "so damn lonesome," they had to drink in order to forget. At Bellevue, on the other hand, it was almost a glimpse of Heaven, so grateful were they for the opportunity of drawing and painting and listening to lectures. Yes, it was a wonderful experience; I am so glad I had it. It was a happy ending of my six months in uniform.

Full of the idea of sharing with our young people these things which mean so much to me I returned to America. You can't do anything for the older ones; you can amuse them—sometimes—

but if you can plant an idea in the hearts of the very young, maybe it is going to open very great vistas of joy and usefulness to them.

Coming home I believe our berths were four deep, but there was room enough to lie and think, and I formulated this little confession of faith, this new creed of mine: (1) We are here in a world of beauty that most of us are missing. (2) We are the heirs of the ages, and we Americans in particular are unappreciative of this great inheritance that is ours. And (3) in every group, every school, there are certain individuals with a "calling." Nature, Providence, has marked them for special expression in life and yet most of them in the past history of America have been like the seed of the parable, springing up gladly, and then withering away for lack of sunshine and soil, that is, sympathy and understanding. There is so much one could tell in detail about this.

What can we do about it? Let us develop these three points for a moment. First, the appreciation of the beauty about us. You find some of the American Indians loved beauty. Blackhawk said the reason they came back was not to scalp the whites, but to have one more look at that beautiful valley they had loved so much. But the average man has to be led to Nature through art. As one of our wits said, "Nature is looking up." Browning tells us that the picture will later reveal itself to us out of doors in the landscape.

I can best illustrate this service of the teacher in a little story, so slight, so foolish, that you will wonder why I tell it.

A group of us artists used to come over into Indiana and camp on the banks of a little lake, Bass Lake, up north of here. Painters and sculptors we gathered there, and toward night the painters would invariably lead us down to the shore, the east bank, and there we would stand, admiring the sunset. Oh, I remember what Whistler said about the people raving over a foolish sunset. If it happened to be "foolish," we criticised the management; but there were times when the "Heavens were telling" and all was so beautiful that we were silent, and our silence was an inaudible prayer of appreciation. At one such moment, my wife felt a twitch at her sleeve. Looking around she saw the little Indiana girl, a farmer's daughter, whom we

employed to look after our first baby—to keep her from falling into the sunset. The little girl was all excitement. My wife said, “What is it?”

“May I run home and tell my people to come and look at the sunset?”

“Yes, of course, but they will see it, anyway, won’t they?”

“Oh, no, they won’t. I never saw the sunset until you folks came.”

There is much in this. It is the service of the teacher, to point out. Stand for a moment and look and the crowd will gather just as it does on the street. Who can tell the value of such a gift to the young people? I believe in it so emphatically that it is easy for me to forgive those who cannot stop talking, “in season and out.”

My second point is something a little less obvious to the American, that is our inheritance from the past. Our daily lives are so casual. Rudyard Kipling speaks somewhere of the Englishman’s ancestors “lying eighteen deep.” Over there every vine-covered wall talks of a proud ancestry of noble achievement. Some may be of one kind, and some of another, but all are conscious of their connection with the past. With us it is so different. Our homes are on casters, sliding around like our furniture. We do not take root in the soil. We go at too terrible a speed to enjoy nature, and the result is we are cut off from almost everything, but we trust that we are going—somewhere!

Now, it seems to me it would be a wonderful thing if we should add to the curriculum of our colleges, not only the classics which at one time were everything and which of late have become much smaller in importance, but a real knowledge of these other achievements in the fine arts.

I wish to come back to this in a moment, but I first desire to speak of that other point, of the talent that is ever appearing. The last time I was in this room was years ago. I was here at the banquet given to Mr. Riley. I had just done a medal of him, and so I got invited and it was a very unusual occasion. I remember asking the famous Indiana poet how it happens that most of our great artists and poets come from the farms and smaller towns. “It is their habit of self-amusement” was the reply, “they have to cultivate the imagination.”

In 1892, at the time we were busy getting up a World's Fair, I had occasion to give a lecture in Decatur, Illinois. At the end of my address a school teacher came up to the platform with a young man and introduced him to me, and told me he was a French boy, born in Lens, in northern France. He was a coal miner. His parents had recently moved to Decatur, and he did me the great honor of understanding my French. That ingratiated him very much with me. The teacher went on to tell me that they were poor people; the boy had no time even for school. In winter he never saw daylight except on Sunday. He went to the coal mine before daylight, and came out again after dark. On Sunday, however, he used to go to the teacher's studio and draw and paint and play the violin, in all of which he showed remarkable talent. I went back to my work where I had charge of a group of decorative sculptors. There was room for another among them, so we sent for this boy. We told him, "Unfortunately we have no time to teach you, but if you want to clean pans and make plaster, here is a job for you. Keep your eyes open and see what you can learn."

We didn't realize how well he was following our admonition. A few weeks later he went home on a brief visit. When he came back in ten days or so, he was carrying a large bundle wrapped in "the world's greatest newspaper," I suppose. It was marvelous, the amount of paper he had wrapped around it. Finally he came to a little head, a portrait of the baby at home. We cried, "Leonard, did you really make that head?"

He asked earnestly, "Is it good?"

Simplicity and modesty have always been his characterizations. We said, "Good! Why, it is worthy of a skilled sculptor." And he had done it without an hour's instruction. I once asked the boy how he accounted for himself. He stopped to think, then told me of his birthplace, a mining town, but not a "hobo mining town." There were public gardens there, and statues and beautiful fountains, and his mother used to point them out to him. "Yes," he said, "I owe it to my mother; you can tell by the names she gave us. My name isn't Leonard, but Leonardo."

"Oh," I said, "you were named after the great Italian artist? What did the neighbors say to that?"

"They said it was outlandish." I realized then the derivation of that word as I never had before.

The next boy's name was Raphael, the next one's Michelangelo and the next, Andrea. I don't know how long she kept on, but here already was the beginning of a Renaissance!

It came over me like a revelation that to that poor peasant woman had been vouchsafed the miracle of motherhood; she had been able to bequeath to her child what she did not herself possess. As Whistler said, "Genius just happens." You cannot account for it. You will find it some times even in the best families.

Do you know what we Americans have been doing with it through the years? I read some words of Mr. Erskine's this morning in which he tells us that the Puritans were a good deal more artistic than we give them credit for; but I have an idea there was not much sculpture and painting, and very little drama, and the music, I fancy, was of a doleful sort. Imagine these talents springing up as they have done in those New England villages, and then wasting away. Why, it seems to me that those things ought to be capitalized for the good of the individual life, and the good of the community.

Now, friends, I have saved myself about seven minutes to tell you of a thing that is very near to my heart. You will think it naïve and impracticable. I have tried it on Chicago audiences; I have written a pamphlet about it. It is the cheapest way to introduce sculpture in a vivid fashion to our western school children and college students.

In my own school, the University of Illinois, we had when I was a boy, a little art gallery of plaster casts, the first collection of the sort west of the Allegheny Mountains. Dr. Gregory brought it there and persuaded the people to support it. I remember that my father gave \$50.00 out of his salary of \$1,800.00. But, oh, what a wonder it was, and what a joy! That little art gallery meant as much to me as the Holy of Holies in the Temple to the chosen people. Later it was scattered all through the buildings and our treasures were put under the stairs and in the cellars. That is what they are doing with plaster casts everywhere. The Fogg Museum announces to the world that it has not a plaster cast on view. That is all right, if you have another

place for them, but to put them completely out of sight is such a pity. It would be like taking all of the great masterpieces of literature out of the public libraries. Our school children no longer have opportunity to see these things at our Art Institute in Chicago.

I am pleading that there be collections of plaster casts. The wealthy people who travel abroad do not realize that most of our people have to stay at home. At one time when I talked, a professor came up to me and said, "That is an interesting thought of yours about lighting sculpture." I am afraid I was a little saucy as I said, "Yes, about as original as the idea of keeping quiet when beautiful music is being played."

Light and shade are essential. But casts become dirty, and people do not know what to do with them, and so gradually they are promoted to the basement. I know now how to keep them clean, and I will confide it to you if you will send me a post card. I know these things can be made immensely eloquent to our school children.

After pleading with the citizens of Chicago and much talking, we saved the old Field Museum, the old art palace of the Columbian Exposition. We saved it seven times. When we finally got it saved, our good friend, Mr. Rosenwald, offered them three million, in addition to the five million voted by the people, and took it over for a museum of industry. All right; the Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away. Blessed be the name of Rosenwald. I think he is one of the finest men we have. I am grateful for the Industrial Museum.

I wrote to Mr. Bogan; I wanted to see some kind of a start made on my scheme. He wrote back that he had an old school building which he thought there would be no difficulty in loaning me. He proposed to take out the partitions and give me two floors over one hundred feet in length.

The dream I have is a museum where you can follow the evolution of the years as they do in the Trocadero; where you can literally walk through the "portals of the centuries," crossing in turn the thresholds of Romanesque and Gothic and Renaissance structures. The children themselves would appreciate this feeling of progress as they study the pageant of the ages.

Light these casts properly; put them in historic sequence; have them in long avenues, aisles, as in a mighty cathedral. Mark the great periods by transepts. You would have to syncope the history of Egypt and Mesopotamia, their history is so absurdly long. Don't you see how easy it would be to learn history, and how interesting? In the fifth century, B. C., you could see at a glance what was happening in Persia, in Egypt; what was happening in Athens. All these things you would learn without any effort, just by association.

Then in the fourth century before Christ, the legions of Alexander and the changes that came in a score of those distant, Oriental lands where their own national art was cut short by his advent. On to the parent stems was now engrafted the Hellenic civilization. And at the end, the climax of Hellenistic art, "The Winged Victory," proclaims the triumph of one of Alexander's generals over another.

I have asked hundreds of our Chicago students who was Emperor of Rome at the time of the birth of Christ. Nobody ever knows. Those who come nearest say Tiberius, which is pretty good for Chicago. I would have a great statue of Augustus Caesar, the one in armor, with the uplifted right hand. I would have that figure gilded, and have a spotlight on it. The children would say, "Who is that shiny man?" They would come to know his name as well as that of "Big Bill."

It has been a pleasure to be here. If any of you are interested, I would be glad to share these circulars with you.

MUSIC IN THE CURRICULUM

JOHN ERSKINE

PRESIDENT OF THE JUILLIARD FOUNDATION

MR. CHAIRMAN, Ladies and Gentlemen: Mr. Taft has given us a dream of the progress of the fine arts, but on the other hand your President thinks that mathematics is a fine art. I take my text from this apparent collision.

If an uninformed visitor from Mars or even from Ancient Greece should examine our catalogues, he would find frequent mention of the arts and sciences, and if he had elementary intellectual training, he would assume that the words meant different things—like lecturer and entertainer. And once they did mean two different things.

The sciences in average human thought had for their purpose accomplishment, some form of power not particularly personal; and the arts had for their purpose performance, very definitely a personal performance, involving an actor, and especially an audience.

And education once had a double function, to train us to know, to gather this power which in a general way we call science, and also to train us to perform, to speak well, to write well, perhaps to debate well, preach sermons, even to sing or play or dance or carve or act; and at least to walk well and stand well, to carry ourselves with poise and to have good manners.

I suppose it was Huxley and others of his period who persuaded us that there is little difference between arts and sciences, and that culture can be got from science, perhaps even a more effective culture than can be got from what used to be the mainstay of the curriculum, the classics.

I don't know whether a body such as this is agreed that Huxley's hope for education has been justified. The professional schools more and more ask that some culture should be a prerequisite in their students, since apparently it isn't a necessary by-product. They usually ask that this culture should be secured in the colleges, and the colleges then arrange pre-professional courses which contain the same material as the professional school, and so culture advances. (Laughter).

I don't believe that it would advance very much better if we asked the boys and girls in college to go back to Latin and Greek, because in my time at least, they also were taught as sciences, not as arts, with the emphasis on the scientific part of the subject, with no hint at all that the study should lead to any performance whatever.

In fact, it is fair to say that the university tradition has been altogether for science, whether it was originally the science of God or the science of law, the science of medicine, or with us, natural sciences. And those much-maligned Puritans did smuggle the arts in for a while, some of them, and they did cultivate eloquence, and some other forms of discourse, which we have entirely abandoned. The only vestige of the arts in our educational system is the complaint that you and I constantly make, that our young people do not perform well; that is, that they do not excel in the subjects which we have refused to teach them.

Mr. Taft thinks that a good many of the boys in the army failed to appreciate art because they had not been to school. I think the trouble with the rest of them was they *had* been to school.

Having stated my point of view with great exaggeration, I should like to describe it to you in detail, knowing perfectly well that I am reminding you of what you know. I should like at least to sum up a tendency in our day to which those of us who deal specifically with the arts would like to call to the attention of our colleagues in general education. I speak about music, since that is my theme, but what I say might be translated just as well into observations on painting and sculpture.

If our friend from Mars, or from Ancient Greece, should look at our colleges, he would find the sciences doing as well as one can reasonably expect, but he would observe very little instruction in the arts. If he were to begin at the other end, however, without knowing anything about the colleges, and examine the kindergarten and the early grades, he would discover that we start the children off just as though we really believed in the arts. We ask them in those grades not only to begin what science they are capable of, but to master in a perfectly proper way, the practice and theory of music, simple drawing, painting, little verses, little plays. We invite them to act their own creations.

We invite them to model. We exhibit their products with great pride. We also instruct them in the more subtle arts of life, in relation to their little society. The visitor from Mars would conclude that if this were to go on for eight or ten years, we should arrive at a college or university of élite youngsters, marvelously weeded out and chosen, whose interest would be in the arts and sciences, and who would be especially capable in the performance of life, in their personal behavior, in their approach to their fellows.

But if he looked farther into the facts, he would discover that the university gives us a degree for knowing how the Greeks danced, but not an ounce of credit for our own dancing—hours and hours of credit to him who listens while someone else tells when Beethoven was born and died, and none to anybody who can play Beethoven, a great deal of credit to people who know approximately these dates which my friend Dr. Taft thinks important. Who *was* Emperor of Rome when Christ was born? I should like to ask the college presidents here who was President of the United States when Poe's *Raven* was written. (Laughter.)

But I shan't ask them, because it isn't of the slightest importance. If they didn't know Poe's *Raven*, we might well be worried.

What happens to those children? Let me remind you, by the time they are in the early school grades, a large proportion of the children of the United States, under the inspiration of the teachers in the lower grades, are receiving private lessons, private now because the schools do not give them, on the piano or the violin, in painting, or in some other art. An enormous investment and sacrifice on the part of the parents, agony of spirit often on the part of the child, go into this work. By the time the child has reached the high school, you strike what seems to be a very bright patch in the development. You find in our country extraordinary numbers of choral groups, which have been developed in the last few decades, really in the last ten years, quite an extraordinary number of school orchestras, which play well; and school bands. If you didn't know the facts, you would think the schools were doing pretty well for music. The truth is, those choral groups and orchestras have been developed largely in spite of our school system. They have been

developed by the energy of certain organizations outside our school system, very much by the energy of the manufacturers of musical instruments who wanted to sell them to the school system.

I am very glad that they wanted to sell them. They have done a lot for culture in the end, but the school doesn't help; the school system in general, if you take us all by and large, may go so far as to give a little credit to the boy and girl who plays in the orchestra, a wretched, parsimonious credit, for the hours spent in rehearsal. I don't think the school authorities know how many hours of private practice and private study must be invested by those boys and girls before they can play in the orchestra.

Now, in the high school, you have outside the orchestras and choral groups, a lot of young barbarians, as far as music is concerned, many of whom are hostile to the art. Most of those who are hostile, have been trying to play the piano and violin and have given it up. When we give up a thing with a sense of wasted effort and futility, we usually get our revenge by hating it for a long time.

I can't let that group go by without a word, the large majority who have dropped their music, who were stimulated by our school system at the beginning to care for the arts, who have lost their child-like enthusiasm and are now prepared to take a proper attitude toward beauty.

You may say that they had better drop the music; they couldn't play anyway; thank God, there is to be comparative silence in their district. But they might have kept on to the point where their music would have been, in a modest degree, a satisfaction to themselves, or to a point where they wouldn't have disliked it, and I can't feel very enthusiastic myself if our education provides us men and women, as the arts by which we express ourselves in our moments of leisure, with nothing but bridge and golf.

But for those who go on, we can make perfectly good prophecies as to their future. They have reached the high school orchestra or chorus: if they don't go to college, they have a very good chance of remaining musicians.

Each week on an average at least two junior orchestras are formed in the United States. These junior orchestras are groups

of amateurs who played in the high school orchestra or band, who didn't go away to college, who want to keep on with their music. Those orchestras are multiplying, as I say, very fast. We must provide these youngsters with proper conductors, and see that their superb interest in music can't die.

They are the lucky ones. Those youngsters who go to college, may find there an excellent glee club, which at their own sacrifice, if they have the physical health to do everything else and that too, they may take part in. They will find a college orchestra which on the average will be worse than the high school orchestra, not because the college does not do its best, but because the student can no longer afford the time for private study with his instrument. He often can't afford the time for private practice, so he comes and saws away on the violin in rehearsals and performances, until the colleges won't stand it, and the organization is temporarily in disrepute, or if revived later by some heroic effort, falls into disrepute again.

When the boy or girl leaves college, there is no impulse left to continue any music. There are rare personal exceptions, I admit. But I don't know of groups of college graduates, like groups of high school graduates, who are forming orchestras for the sake of playing together.

I admit there is a difference. The high school graduate is likely to remain in the town, and the college graduate, of course, is likely to go to his own place far from the college, but even so there are many Columbia, Harvard, Yale and Princeton men in New York City, and none that I know of in an orchestra.

We are not worrying about the future of music in America. I am speaking of the future of it in our college education, of the opportunity the college has to help, at least by recognizing music as a useful thing to practice.

I am quite sure that many of you here are thinking that I have overlooked certain obvious facts. You are thinking that one can earn a large part of your degree in most colleges by taking music courses, and some of you are reflecting that your college has a conservatory of music.

I am not speaking of the professional musician, but of the college student, the ordinary human being who isn't going into a musical career. Those music courses in which you get credits are almost never practical courses; they are courses in the his-

tory, appreciation, and theory of music. They are excellent courses, but they do nothing to aid the students who now in large groups drop their music as soon as they come near a college. On the other hand, the professional musician, and I think the sensible general educator, is rather doubtful about the wisdom of attaching a conservatory to a college. I know there are some splendid conservatories in some of our universities, but if you have a conservatory, you must measure it by professional standards. Very few universities can hope to compete in their music department with the endowed professional schools of music; it is rather foolish to invite the comparison.

A number of us are wondering if the time isn't coming for the colleges to consider music as a practical study on an equality with mathematics, or with history or English. We don't pretend that the boys who take mathematics will turn out to be great mathematicians, but we do hope, modestly, that they won't know less mathematics when they leave college than when they came in. That is all I hope for music. If any college would undertake to see that the boys and girls know as much music when they leave as when they entered, the future of music in the college group would be brightened. We could reach this result rather easily if we could find a place in the curriculum for daily practice, and for the private instruction of individuals who at entrance satisfy the college authorities as to their fitness in music.

Most college trustees, deans and presidents would be troubled by the expense of such an undertaking. That is because they are thinking in terms of conservatories and expensive music schools. There are ways of teaching music to people already fairly well started which are not so very expensive. There are ways of using teachers in the community at no great cost to the college itself, and musicians could tell the general educator what those ways are.

I am sure that others of you are thinking that the curriculum is too crowded already, and that, if we added music, the jam would be awful. Well, I have been a college professor for over a quarter of a century, and like you, I have no respect whatever for the curriculum as such. I admit it is jammed, but we all know that any curriculum at all, in a normal American college, has been put together like a tariff bill, not on the principle with

which we started out, but as the result of negotiation and compromise among the various departments. Few of us believe it would make much difference if the student got the years mixed, and took the junior courses before his sophomore. It would make little difference if he got the numbers mixed, and spent as many hours in zoology as we hoped he would give to English. He would be touched or untouched equally by both subjects in either case.

Since English is my own subject, I would suggest that we take the time out of that and give it to music. English has seized the time the classics used to have, and all the other hours we could get. But there is little point in teaching literature as an art, unless the student knows some other art, too. If English is to be taught only as a science, then the student needs to know nothing about sculpture, or painting, or music. But if you treat poetry and drama as art, you ought to know what art is. If I had the choice, therefore, of teaching a student six hours a week or teaching him three hours with the understanding that the rest of the time he should give to the practice of music, I would have him take the music. He would be a better student and a better man.

We have heard it said that in the history of our education we usually can tell what will get into the curriculum later by noticing what the families are willing to pay for privately in addition to their regular school bills. The cost of the musical education of the country is enormous. There is a growing need among our young people to express themselves nobly and beautifully, and to some of us it seems a pity that the colleges and universities don't say, God bless you, to the extent of giving academic credit for the practice of an art.

If there were time, I would argue to a finish with educators who say that music is not such good disciplinary matter as mathematics, or history or literature. Students have copied the answers in their mathematics from their friends; they have got up the history recitation during morning chapel; and they have asked their friends as they came into the room what was the plot of Dickens' novel. But nobody has ever got two hours' of practice in anything less than 120 minutes, and if the practice isn't the right kind, the student can't get the right results with the teacher, and when he plays his piece, he is helped out by no lucky break in the professor's questions. The student of music

must perform his whole task. The esteem in which we held the ancient Greeks is pretty much a sham unless we believe with them that there is a benefit in beautiful performance, and unless we believe that it is the duty and privilege of every man and woman to practice some art well.

The musical foundations and the musical societies of the country can advance the cause of music in general. It is only you, gentlemen, in organizations such as yours, who can bring general education into closer touch with the arts. I hope the day is coming when you will care to appoint a committee which might include some people who know the practical aspects of music teaching, to report to the whole college community of this country ways and means of introducing music into our program on an equality with mathematics, history, literature, etc. We need to know how to meet the expense of music education, by what method to organize it, and what changes and omissions in our present curriculum would be needed to make room for it. If you appoint such a committee, one of the educational foundations might well finance its work.

We curse out the younger generation for lack of culture, for lack of manners. But we don't teach those things in college. We expect them, but we don't teach them. Every young musician who faces an audience has to have good manners, or he is not asked to face it again. He knows that his personality is part of his equipment, as it is of every other human being. But in college, where we ask accomplishment rather than performance, we accept the work of a student if it shows brains, even though, the student has no manners at all, even though the work as a performance ought to get zero. Some of us professors are distinguished for our accomplishment rather than for our performance. When we speak or write, our audience knows approximately what we mean, and respects us in so far as it can guess our intention. But an education which included the arts as well as the sciences would ask even us, the teachers, to be to some extent artists in the expression of what we give our minds to. How are we to return to the polite tradition, the artistic tradition of education in our country, unless at the pinnacle of our system in the universities, we put the arts once more on something like an equality with at least some of the sciences?

THE PERIL IN MASS EDUCATION

MELVIN E. HAGGERTY

DEAN, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

A SINISTER shadow hovers about the title set for this symposium. Most of us are conscious of an ominous halo attending the word mass as applied to education. It suggests unwieldy bulk and uncontrollable size. It calls to memory the troublous concepts of physics, or that "homogeneous lump compounded by pharmacists for the making of pills." The implied loss of individual identity is promptly repellent to all our notions about human values, the enhancement of which is the precious prerogative of education. Personality and individual salvation, here, if not hereafter, are still watchwords of western civilization, the accepted essence of all our thinking about social institutions. The submergence of ourselves, or of our children beneath any mass movement, whether it be that of war or education, is simply intolerable to our culture, and with fine unanimity we rebel at the suggestions deriving from the phrase *mass education*.

This recoil from the feared inundation of individuals beneath the ever-mounting tide of schooling is so pervasive of all our thinking about recent tendencies in education that it seems to arise from some widespread native quality in human nature. One may often suspect in reading current criticisms of our continuously enlarging schools and colleges that this negative reaction frequently has little to support it except a kind of instinctive fear of size and numbers. It searches but hesitatingly, or not at all, for facts concerning the fate of individuals in modern schools, but contents itself with the exploitation of such opprobrious terms as standardization, uniformity, and mass, all of which are interpreted to imply an inescapable mediocrity.

The futility of such merely negative writing will, it may be predicted, gradually appear as unworthy the dignity of educational endeavor, and we shall set about systematically to identify with exactness the perils lurking in mass education. We shall endeavor to learn just what group education does to individuals

and how they may be protected against the baneful influence which men suspect to arise from the increasing size of our institutions. The welfare of individuals we must accept as the fundamental issue. What do our schools do to individuals? What must we do, and what can we do, to insure to individuals a wholesome personal development through the schools? How must we shape our institutions for maximum service in the care and culture of human personalities? This is the central issue in our consideration of mass education.

Only facts can guide us in the answer to questions such as we have just stated, facts such as the historian accepts and the biologist strives to discover. It is our embarrassment that the body of accurate information bearing upon these issues is too meager to provide an adequate basis for the administration of higher institutions and for the satisfactory solution of our difficult problems—problems as intricate as the universe and fraught with values as dear as life itself.

TWENTY-ONE QUERIES

For the sake of giving point to the view just expressed I beg to offer twenty-one queries about which we should have authentic data if we are to deal intelligently with the gross size of our institutions of higher learning. They by no means cover the range of problems with which educational administrators must deal, but the mere stating of them suggests the copious ignorance which inevitably clouds our discussions in this matter. It may be hoped also that such a statement may suggest the importance of research in the field of higher education.

1. What are the basic facts that warrant us in believing that group education is increasing in America?
2. As students congregate in larger academic communities what happens to institutional provisions for student welfare?
3. As students are gathered into larger classes how is their learning affected?
4. Is the social education of young people more difficult in large student communities?
5. Is the acquisition of ideals, and particularly of religious ideals and practices, more difficult among large groups?

6. In the larger academic community is emotional maladjustment of students and faculty increased?
7. Is the faculty-student relationship more tenuous in large institutions?
8. Does the large institution labor under peculiar difficulties in providing satisfactory curricular adjustments?
9. Does the large college have peculiar difficulties in attracting distinguished teachers for its students?
10. Will it be possible to provide competent teachers for all students desiring college education?
11. Does largeness in an institution involve excessive outlay in administration?
12. What happens to educational costs as institutions grow in size?
13. Is the examining function better performed in smaller colleges?
14. Are the general cultural and non-curricular functions such as are possible in music, art, general lectures, and athletics more difficult in large institutions?
15. Are adequate library facilities more difficult to provide in large institutions?
16. Is the selection of student bodies more satisfactorily accomplished in small institutions?
17. Is the small college better suited to the cultivation and preservation of wholesome academic traditions?
18. What advantages has the small institution in breaking down the barriers that foster the limiting provincialism so characteristic of American life?
19. Where lies the advantage in building up those influences that create and cherish an intense and intrepid intellectual life?
20. Is social welfare, and thus indirectly individual welfare, threatened by the rising tide of education at the college level? Are we, as some fear, schooling too large a portion of our population?
21. What is the optimum institutional size for the highest educational efficiency? Is it five hundred, a thousand, five thousand, ten thousand, or infinity?

All the issues raised by these queries, if not created, are at least made crucial by the American effort to educate all our population, an effort which has lifted our college population

from 44,317 in 1870 to 627,958¹ in 1926, and called into currency the term mass education. Those who are responsible for college administration have had to come to terms with all of them and to make working adjustments in the particular situations which have presented themselves. Few will claim, however, that these immediately necessary adjustments have always been made on the basis of adequate factual information. Traditions, beliefs, insights, the limitations of available resources, personal judgments, frequently wise, but generally unsupported by data, have been the warp through which we have woven the cloth of institutional practices. The wisdom of many of these practices some of us have been led to doubt, and these doubts have led to a search for facts upon which to justify or alter our procedures.

It may well be believed that this search for authenticated information is only begun, that it will become more thorough and scientific in the years to come, and that it will increasingly pervade realms long believed immune from scientific inquiry. This discussion can serve no purpose more usefully than the acceleration of such inquiry on the part of collegiate institutions. The immediate results of experimental investigations, however important they may appear, are much less significant in their details than would be a changed basis in the discussion of college problems, an eager and widespread utilization of the methods of educational research in the field of higher education.

INCREASING GROUP EDUCATION

Is group education increasing? The gross figures commonly cited on college enrolments imply that it is. The total figures, however, are insufficient to answer our query because faculties also increase and even institutions multiply. The writer has been at some pains to discover the extent of increase in group education at the college level. From such records as are available he is attempting, with the aid of Mr. Leonard Fleenor, to determine the actual college enrolment in the United States from the year 1636 to the present time. This study is far from com-

¹ College students. Figures do not include graduate students, or students in professional schools. Published figures are frequently difficult to interpret since the categories change from time to time and require analysis and re-assembling. Despite the difficulties it is believed the data here reported are fairly indicative of changing conditions.

plete and is baffled at numerous points by inability to uncover dependable records. Even so, the facts disclose certain trends over the most recent period that have a bearing upon our present discussion. In the year 1870 there were 224 institutions of collegiate rank in the United States enrolling a total of 44,317 students. The average size of a college at that date appears to have been 197 students and the range in size was great. One college reported eight students of college grade, but another had 776.

It has been possible to obtain what appear to be fairly accurate figures for a selected group of seventy-two institutions of higher learning from 1875 to 1925. These colleges are distributed throughout the country and include all the recognizable types. Using the faculty-student ratio as an indicator of conditions, one may gather an impression of trends through a fifty-year period. Considering all the institutions as a unit the faculty-student ratio in 1875 was 1 to 10.7. One college reported as many in the faculty as it had students, but in another college on that date the ratio was 1 to 28.3. For certain well-known institutions the ratios were as follows: Yale University, 1 to 22.4; University of Illinois, 1 to 14.4; DePauw University, 1 to 23.3; Amherst, 1 to 16.7; Harvard, 1 to 18; University of Michigan, 1 to 13.5; Williams College, 1 to 12.3; Dartmouth, 1 to 9.6; Princeton, 1 to 22.5; Columbia, 1 to 16.8; Syracuse, 1 to 14; Oberlin, 1 to 26.5; Brown, 1 to 17; Virginia, 1 to 23; Wisconsin, 1 to 10. The lowest ratios are to be found in the less well-known institutions and it would require a robust confidence in abstract mathematics to believe these low ratios to be indicative of superior educational conditions. Using the ratios for the entire group of seventy-two institutions we gain a picture of what changing educational conditions have meant for the total group. By ten-year intervals these ratios are as follows: 1875, 1 to 10.7; 1885, 1 to 11.08; 1895, 1 to 11.4; 1905, 1 to 11.5; 1915, 1 to 10.7; 1925, 1 to 12.6. For individual colleges at this most recent date the figures are, California, 1 to 12.5; Stanford, 1 to 12; Wesleyan, 1 to 10; Illinois Wesleyan, 1 to 16; Northwestern, 1 to 14.6; Grinnell, 1 to 15.4; Colby, 1 to 18.4; Amherst, 1 to 11.7; Williams, 1 to 11.3; Minnesota, 1 to 13.3; Kalamazoo, 1 to 14.1; Dartmouth, 1 to 10.7; Colgate, 1 to 14.6; Oberlin, 1 to 14.3; Dickinson, 1 to 19.2; Wisconsin, 1 to 6.2.

In certain of the largest institutions there appears to have been a decided decrease in ratios. This group includes Yale University, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, Harvard University, Princeton University, Columbia University, University of Virginia, and the University of Wisconsin. Available data, however, are not unequivocal since the influence of growing graduate and professional schools upon the apparent ratios is not always eliminated from published figures.

From all available information, however, it does not appear that there has been any startling or threatening increase in faculty-student ratios in American colleges during the half-century from 1875 to 1925. In fact, the figures for 1915 are identical with those for 1875 and have stepped up only a small amount in the past decade.

We could evaluate the meaning of this ratio curve intelligently if we knew just what such a ratio should be. Is this increase ominous to the welfare of individual students, or are the fluctuations still within the safety zone? Having no confident answer to this question it would be well to drop the discussion at this point. However, two further bits of information may be added. At my request Dr. F. W. Reeves, who is now engaged upon a survey of the colleges fostered by the Methodist Episcopal Church, provided me with information concerning the faculty-student ratio in these institutions. I will quote from his letter in reply.

For twenty-one colleges for which data are available for 1929-30, the median ratio of full-time faculty members to full-time students is 1 to 15, and the range in these ratios is from 1 to 8.2 to 1 to 30.6. Eleven of these twenty-one institutions are on the approved list of the Association of American Universities. For these institutions the median ratio is 1 to 15.8, and the range is from 1 to 12.5, to 1 to 19.2. While I do not have available data for these institutions for an earlier period, I did obtain similar information from a group of twenty liberal arts colleges of various denominations for the year 1923-24. For these institutions the ratios ranged from 1 to 8, to 1 to 12, with a median ratio of 1 to 10. I am of the opinion that the difference between the ratios obtained in 1923-24 and those obtained in 1929-30 is due primarily to the year for which this information was obtained, and not to the fact that different institutions are

represented. I cannot be sure concerning this matter, however, because in no case do we have data for the same institution for different periods of time.

The second item is from Hudelson who, subsequently to the publication of his Minnesota experiments, made a survey of the trends of class size in forty-eight states receiving information from 386 institutions. He writes,

In privately endowed colleges there is a very marked two-fold tendency, namely, smaller recitation sections and larger lecture sections. In state universities the trend is toward offering more of the work in the form of lectures, but the number of highly specialized courses is also increasing. For the strategy of boasting limited enrolments and small classes in order to secure more students and bigger classes has succeeded. Colleges that ten years ago were struggling for students are now struggling with them.

He notes further:

There is a good deal of popular misunderstanding about relative size of classes in public and private institutions. People with whom small classes are a fetish point to state universities in horror and pray that their children and their children's children may be spared the iniquities of "mass education." There is a higher proportion of classes under eleven in size in state universities than there is in privately endowed colleges; and if the lecture portion of part-lecture courses be excluded, the average class size in state universities is lower than that in privately endowed colleges. There is also a higher percentage of large classes in state universities; but the abundance of small classes holds the average down to 18.6, whereas the average in privately endowed colleges is 19.6. The big-class reputation of state universities usually comes from a few courses in which several recitation sections are combined for lectures once or twice a week. The same policy maintains in most privately endowed colleges, the main difference being that the lecture groups in state universities are larger because more students are enrolled.

HOW IS STUDENT WELFARE INFLUENCED?

Let us turn to another of our twenty-one queries. As students congregate in larger academic communities what happens to

institutional provision for student welfare? This question naturally fractionates into a number of parts. What about student housing and feeding? Since the opening days of Harvard College this has been a perplexing problem in American colleges. In few, if in any of them, has it been solved to the complete satisfaction of students. But are the smaller institutions more adequate in these matters than the larger colleges? What about student health? Where will one find the most scientific and humane provisions for student health? What about discipline? Does the incidence of student delinquency, bear any constant relation to the size of an institution? What about student guidance in all the matters that relate to intellectual life, personal problems, and vocational choice and preparation? Does the size of an institution determine the facility with which it may provide faculty service in such affairs?

Frankly, I do not know an exact answer to any of these questions, and should strongly suspect that any ready answer would be made in the absence of basic facts, discoverable but undiscovered. Upon one other issue in the field of student affairs in one large institution I can offer some material. Thanks to Dr. F. S. Chapin and a committee of our staff, we have a study of student participation in non-curriculum activities. Though we are wont to decry the apparent excess of student activity, few would deny the usefulness of some social experience for every college student, and if studies of scholarship, made as a part of, or as a result of the Carnegie investigation of athletics, and the studies of business success made by Bridgman² should be confirmed by succeeding investigations, we may come to an even higher evaluation of non-curricular functions. In any case the degree to which activities are open to all students and are widely participated in may be accepted as one measure of an institution's competence in such matters. When Professor Chapin's committee began its studies in 1924 it could find but two reports carrying factual data concerning extra-curricular activities in higher institutions. The number of studies has increased but slowly and is still far from adequate. The Minnesota study sought answer to a number of questions which may be stated as follows:

² Bridgman, Donald S., "Success in College and Business," *The Personnel Journal*, Vol. IX, No. 1, June, 1930.

1. What opportunities for extra-curricular experience, both in number and kind, are to be found in the University of Minnesota?

2. To what degree do students participate in the available activities?

3. What draft upon student time does such participation make?

4. Is there any discoverable relationship between extra-curricular participation and scholastic achievement?

5. What, if any, carry-over into later life follows student participation?

The investigation used a carefully controlled questionnaire method and the report is replete with detailed results most of which need not detain us now. Three hundred well defined activities were found current in a student population of approximately 10,000 students. Two-thirds of all replying students, 4,637, regarded as a fair sample of the entire student community, reported participation in one or more campus activities. Many of the remaining one-third reported similar activity off the campus. One-third earn money while in school, more than a third attend church and do religious work off the campus, senior college students are more "active" than freshmen and sophomores, 57 per cent attend theaters and movies while school is in session, more than a third attend concerts, one-fifth are in athletics, 6 per cent are active in student publications, 4 per cent are in dramatics.

The median number of hours spent in extra-curricular activities varies greatly among students and collegiate divisions, and does not appear greatly excessive. Students who participate in several campus activities concurrently have a slightly higher average in academic achievement than do others, and active participation in activities appears to be "not necessarily detrimental to scholarship." There is a substantial carry-over from campus activities to life activities and "64 per cent of alumni consider that extra-curricular activities have equal or more value than class-room work that requires the same amount of time."

No one would claim that any of these findings are conclusive, even for the institution in which they were obtained. Dr. Chapin's report makes generous allowances for the obvious limi-

tations of the method employed and bristles with suggestions for further and better controlled researches. Significance does inhere, however, in the fact that we have here a courageous effort to inject the methods of clear thinking into one of the most vague and elusive realms of higher education. Should investigation end here it may have small consequence, but if from this point we can push persistent inquiry into the many problems here made definitive, we may sometime in the future be able to speak with knowledge about the desirable size of an institution for the best administration of extra-curricular functions. Until then we may well forego conclusions.

STUDENT EXPERIENCES IN LARGE INSTRUCTIONAL GROUPS

Can students learn in groups or must instruction be individual? If not individual, how large may groups become without detriment to student learning? Despite the wide currency of our Minnesota experiments upon class size and the generally favorable criticism which they have received, it should be said that none of us believe that these experiments have given the final answer to this question. They have dispelled the rather superficial belief that the general increase of numbers in classes is inimical to the learning of students. Practically all of Dr. Hudelson's results are directly opposed to this view and the experiments were sufficiently varied in procedure, so distributed among academic fields, and so inclusive in numbers that the general belief can no longer be maintained. Yet attention should be called to the caution with which Professor Hudelson states his conclusion:

In the light of all available evidence, class size seems to be a relatively minor factor in educational efficiency, measured in terms of student achievement. What the major factors are we do not know; to be determined they must be isolated, controlled and tested, one at a time. Nor do we know whether there are important educational outcomes other than achievement accruing, or at least accruable, only from small classes, or whether experiments by other instructors using the same or different teaching methods in the same or other departments or courses would produce similar results. All that can be said is that in the courses investigated, the effect of class size upon student achievement is, in the opinion of the subcommittee, too slight to warrant the cost of small classes.

Extensive as these class-size studies have been they should be regarded but as a beginning, as a clearing of the ground for more intensive studies which should follow. The method is applicable to the differential investigation of many problems subsidiary to the one already studied. May I mention certain groupings of such problems. There is, first of all, the matter of grade advancement. In how far are freshmen different from seniors in the susceptibility to group influence? Secondly, there is the rather varied subject matter. This problem involves not merely the distinction between chemistry and French, but quite as much the different character of courses within a single academic field, as in history. Again, there is the matter of the instructor. Is he a large- or a small-class individual? It seems perfectly clear that college teachers differ in their capacities to interest and instruct large groups of students, a matter that should have careful scrutiny by college administrators. As a part of this question is the subsidiary one, Can a small-class instructor become, through training and experience, a large-class instructor? Closely related to this is the matter of methods of teaching. Are there methods of teaching especially available for large classes? Do instructors dealing with large classes make adequate adaptations of their procedures to the size of the group? What are the desirable outcomes of class-room experience aside from the acquisition of subject matter? Can these be isolated, described and made the subject of further study? What new modes of evaluation must we employ to give balance to our thinking about group instruction? To all such questions and to others that might be offered we need answers that may be stated in quantitative and objective terms. Such answers can not be developed in the traditionally conducted faculty meeting or by the usual methods of committee procedure. They imply the most rigorous experimental analysis, the devotion of time to investigation, and incidentally the suspension of judgment until the findings are available.

STUDENT COUNSELLING

What bearing has the size of an institution upon the personal problems of students? We are all well aware that in the decade since the World War interest in the varied problems of student

counselling has increased, and institutions have multiplied the agencies for this function. New officers have been created, varied forms of expert service from the fields of psychology, medicine, and industry have been invoked. Advisory systems and orientation courses have been provided and the whole world of secondary and higher education has experienced an awakening to the age-old problems of human adjustment. The usefulness of these new devices we have yet to learn, but they have appeared in colleges of every size and kind. What appears to be the most complete and satisfactory counselling service which has come to our attention is to be found in a junior college connected with a public high school, involving a relatively small body of college students. On the other hand, the large institutions have also been active and in some of these one finds the most expert psychological and psychiatric service that it is possible to obtain anywhere in the world. The effectiveness of these efforts, the most satisfactory way in which they may be organized, the essential costs, are all matters upon which we must speak with caution in institutions of any size and character.

While we must not be inveigled into final judgments about our new efforts, it is important that every promising venture in improved student management should be described and its results set forth. Does the large institution conduce to increase the students' personal problems of maladjustment? I do not know but I can offer some data from the experience of one large institution. Among its other provisions for improved student guidance the University of Minnesota has retained since February, 1928, the full-time services of a psychiatrist. This officer is located in the Students' Health Service, with commodious and adequate quarters in the new students' health building. The phrase full-time is entirely appropriate as applied to this University officer, for during the period of about fifteen months Dr. deBerry studied individually 551 students. The time required per student ranged from one hour to fifty hours. Many of these students were also the subject of study by other physicians, by psychologists, social workers, deans, and faculty advisors.

Dr. deBerry says:

It is extremely difficult to make any classification of the problems handled in the service. They range through

everything from acute and violent psychoses to minor problems of vocational adjustment. These latter may require only one interview. The bulk of the work lies somewhere in between these two extremes. The patients are not disturbed enough to be sent to hospitals, and often can be kept in the University. Their emotional problems, however, are usually severe enough to interfere seriously with efficiency in school work and happiness in contact with other students.

Following this statement, Dr. deBerry lists in detail the various conditions that seemed to have "a direct bearing on the emotional condition of the student." This list includes 175 specialized and apparently crucial conditions distributed into ten groupings as follows:

- I. Physical illnesses
- II. Physical symptoms, which after thorough physical examination seem to have no basis in physical pathology
- III. Problems involving intellectual endowment and scholastic work
- IV. Interests
- V. Social problems
- VI. Family situations
- VII. Miscellaneous emotional problems and conditions—border-line mental illness
- VIII. Psychoses
- IX. Sex problems
- X. Vocational problems

The degree to which this group of individual cases reflects the incidence of emotional maladjustment among our students is not clear. It probably does not include all but on the surface it would seem to confirm the earlier finding of Morrison and Diehl that 3.5 per cent of Minnesota students are subject to emotional difficulties. It is clear, however, that disturbed students are not necessarily persons of low intelligence. Some of the severe cases are of high intelligence and good scholastic records. In how far these conditions could have been prevented, the degree to which permanent readjustment is possible, how these students would have fared in a smaller academic community, how they might have succeeded in industry or at home, all are matters of conjecture as yet and will so remain until we can accumulate further information in varied institutions—high schools, colleges, industries—and under controlled experimental conditions. It is some gain, however, that such studies are in progress in a number of our colleges.

We might continue this analysis of our twenty-one queries at length, but in each case the issue would be the same. We do not know enough about any of them to be scientifically just in our conclusions. We have possibly gone far enough by way of illustration to promote confidence in the proposition that the peril in mass education is ignorance of results. It is easy to theorize, even to dogmatize about higher education. It is difficult to restrain our intellectual commitments and to keep an open mind. Yet such restraint is the very essence of the scholar's mind. Unless we can keep an open mind about matters educational we must degrade our business to something less than knowledge, something short of science. In particular, we may stress a necessary caution to the experimentalists themselves, namely, not to trust too completely the first fruits of investigation. Most of our endeavors are as yet but partial and inadequate for radical administrative changes. They do little more than to relax the coercion long exercised by traditional beliefs and to ease our minds about some of the conditions created by the growing number of college students. Results do not as yet enable us to chart our course with scientific precision. Intelligence tests, objective examinations, curriculum analysis, instructional experimentation, case studies,—each has served to quicken our interests, given us new data and probably improved our orientation in educational thinking, but in all these matters we have skimmed so lightly the surface of our educational problems as to halt any great pride in accomplishment. The unknown is still very great.

May I state the intent of this discussion in the form of a working program. Those who are interested in the improvement of higher education should engage to promote extensively and thoroughly the investigation of the problems of higher education. Methods are difficult, the workers competent to do such work are not many at present, and an effective program will be expensive. None of these deterrents should be accepted as preventive.

America today has more than twelve hundred institutions of higher learning (1282 in 1927-28). These institutions enroll more than a million young people (1,135,917 in 1927-28). These students are taught by seventy-six thousand (76,111) in-

structors. The value of all college property is nearly three billion dollars (\$2,999,635,329). The total expenditure in the year 1927-28 was \$551,413,400. A further fact of great significance is found in the acceleration of all descriptive figures in this field during the past decade with but little evidence that the rapidly rising curves of increase are flattening out toward horizontal. The year 1927-28 showed gifts to higher education approximating \$120,000,000 and the figures for later years, if available, would doubtless show a considerable step-up.

Notwithstanding the superlative character of these figures it appears that relatively little energy or money is being devoted to studies bearing upon the character, problems, and results of college activities. The policy of operating this enormous educational program without research to guide administration is distinctly at variance with enlightened practice in the fields of industry and business where elaborate programs of research are fostered with a view to continuing improvement. It is also strangely out of keeping with the expansion of knowledge and the development of scientific research increasingly stimulated and fostered by institutions of higher learning themselves. The time has long since arrived and the need becomes increasingly imperative for thoroughgoing studies of the problems of higher education. Institutions and all interested in higher education may well ask if it is not the part of wisdom to devote to such study substantial sums of money even though such money must be taken from the resources of the institutions themselves. Every wisdom at our command dictates the devotion of some of our energies to the study of our problems. We should *know* as well as *do*, and we may well entertain the belief that ten million dollars expended in educational research at the college level would do more to promote the cause of higher education in America than would the use of that amount to expand and repair existing institutions or to establish new ones. Could we spend two or three million dollars a year through competent research agencies upon the study of our problems, a decade would give us a body of information by which to chart our course far more intelligently than we are now doing. May we hope that some day wise men in positions of power will see the point to this argument.

THE HARVARD HOUSE PLAN

A. LAWRENCE LOWELL

PRESIDENT OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

IN attempting to explain the House plan, I feel like one who, should attempt to explain to foreigners—highly intelligent, no doubt, but quite ignorant of our customs—the nature of mince pie. To describe the water, flour, fruit, etc., etc., that go into the making of the pie would give to the stranger little idea of its flavor, and might not sound attractive. It may, indeed, be some time before the students who live in the Houses understand it themselves, for as mere places of residence the Houses are of secondary value. The factors that go to make up the plan are important, but the essential matter is the combination, the whole, that is thereby created. These factors, however, must be explained, and I hope not at wearisome length.

First, let me say that with the common estimate of the American college I wholly disagree. It is the habit to belittle it in comparison with the graduate school; to speak of the latter as the university and the college as a continuation of the secondary school, hardly a part of higher education. With that point of view I am in hearty disaccord. The graduate school is a professional school. Its students are preparing to be teachers and, in the case of a small minority, productive scholars. It is not a place for giving a high type of education to the future lawyers, doctors, business men and statesmen. That should be done by the college, and its work should be of university grade. There is no reason why our best colleges should not do as good work in this way as Oxford and Cambridge; different, of course, by reason of national divergencies—not so good in some subjects, but better in others. So far as it can be attained, education of this type should be the aim of the American college. To put it in a more abstract form, what should that aim be? Is it not to produce young people who can think clearly and deeply and who enjoy reading and thinking that is permanently worth while?

There has been much discussion about the subjects to be included in the curricula; and that is important, but to my mind much less vital than the spirit in which they are studied

and important chiefly as they contribute to that spirit. Such discussions have tacitly assumed that the object of the undergraduate is to get the best education the college can give, an assumption without regard to fact. The real defect of the American college has lain less in what it has taught, than in the fact that the students, in the main, have not taken their education seriously. As Woodrow Wilson—the first college president who tried to remedy that condition—said, the side-shows overshadowed the main tent. In short, what has been needed is a change in atmosphere, in tone, not by reducing the outside activities, but by increasing the interest in scholarly ones until the right relation is established.

For a time the theory held sway that since boys or men would work most earnestly on the subjects in which they were interested, they were to choose such subjects for their work. It was excellent for those who had real intellectual interests, for it enabled them to pursue their favorite studies farther and more profoundly; but the mass of college students have not developed strong intellectual interests, and hence in practice the theory did not change the general tone of the undergraduate body. It did not provoke respect for scholarship, or a widespread ambition to excel. It is these that determine the character of a college and its value as an institution of higher learning. There may be many ways of reaching a result, all good so far as they reach it. Different experiments are desirable; nor should all colleges be alike, their aim the same or at the same level. Therefore I am not advocating a plan, but merely describing how in our way we have tried to improve a condition that is not uncommon.

We have proceeded on three principles,—

First: that in most cases interest comes from effort before effort is produced by interest.

Second: that all education beyond the grade of drill is essentially self-education. By no process can a man be educated against his will. The teacher can help, explain, guide and stimulate, but education comes from personal effort of the pupil.

Third: that a man is a whole; not a series of independent mental thought-tight compartments, but a complete whole, which is best guided by someone who, so far as possible, understands that whole.

In carrying out these principles it has seemed that the goal set before the student should be sufficiently remote to entail a long sustained effort towards a definite end, and not so remote as to be lost from sight. It should not be so broad that all its parts cannot be correlated, yet broad enough to require personal work outside any courses of instruction. For this purpose a general, or comprehensive, examination for graduation has been set up in the subject of the student's major work, or, as we call it, his field of concentration. This began with one division or group of departments, being first put into operation for the Class of 1917; and it has gradually been extended by the voluntary action of departments until it now includes all but one of them.

In adopting the plan of a general examination in the student's field of concentration we have not given up courses, or the examinations and marks in courses, and this for two reasons. A wise skipper approaching a coast does not trust to observations alone, but also takes soundings. The examinations are valuable as showing the progress of the student. They enable him, as well as the college, to know his position and how he is getting on. Moreover, the danger of the tutorial system, if carried too far, is that the student comes into contact with only one teacher. It is an immense benefit to him to come under the influence of other distinguished men, and that not merely by hearing them lecture, but by the closer association involved in the discussion, the thesis and the examination of a systematic course.

It is customary in this country to conceive of the college as divided into two parts,—the first, covering the freshman and sophomore years, being a completion of secondary education or, at best, a preparation for work of a higher grade; and the junior and senior years, as giving that more advanced study. To us it has seemed that the larger proportion of time that could be given to work of a university character, the better; and by sifting the students at entrance by examination and then driving them fairly hard in the freshman year, we could begin the more advanced type of instruction at the opening of the sophomore year. We do, indeed, drive the freshmen rather hard, as can be seen from the fact that about 20 per cent of them fail to win their promotion. By these means we are enabled to require the stu-

dent to select his subject of concentration towards the close of his freshman year, in May, and he is then assigned to a tutor; for if the examination is really to cover a subject and not be a review of courses, the student must have help in equipping himself for it, and this is provided by means of tutors. They are neither coaches nor disciplinary officers, but guides, philosophers and friends, and are habitually so regarded by their pupils. To be a tutor is a function, not a grade. In mathematics, for example, all the members of the department do some tutoring, and the effect on the proficiency of the men is reported as marked. In the beginning young men, of course, had to be appointed as tutors, for the habits of the older ones were too fixed for a new type of instruction; but now many of the tutors are giving at least one course and they comprise men of all ages to the senior professors.

A similar system, under the name of honors courses, has of late been adopted for high grade students in several colleges, and in fact an oral examination of a comprehensive character has been used in the case of candidates for honors at Harvard in my recollection for more than half a century; and here it seems necessary to explain that the phrase "honors courses" is used in two senses,—one signifying a method of instruction, the other a degree of attainment. Let me illustrate by reference to some of the colleges of Oxford, of which Balliol was the first, which admit only students registered in some one of the "honour schools." Now degrees in those schools are awarded in four classes, of which the last certainly does not indicate distinguished work. Indeed, it is often said that a fourth class in an honour school is easier to get than a pass degree. However that may be, it certainly does not mean distinction; but it does indicate a definite curriculum, if I may use the word, and method of examination thereon. So, in the same way, honors courses in this country mean a form of instruction, but those who pursue them do not necessarily do work that merits distinction.

In colleges that have adopted the honors courses for high grade students, the number of men taking advantage of them has almost everywhere been small. Excellent as the system may be for those few, it does not, under these conditions, affect the great mass of the student body, or change the attitude and spirit

of the college. Forseeing that result, and believing that many men capable of superior scholarship who would not elect it early in their college course would, after working with their tutors, become eager students, we applied it to all undergraduates concentrating in the departments adopting it, and we award honors to those who do a really high grade of work. These honors are of three grades, and altogether they may be said to be equivalent to the first, second and part of the third classes at Oxford, the men who do not take honors with us being comparable to the rest of the third and the fourth class there.

The general examinations are taken very seriously by the students, and rightly so, for a considerable number of men who have passed all their courses fail in this test. At first it was about 10 per cent, but as the requirements are better understood, it has tended to diminish and is now between 7 and 8 per cent; somewhere near half the men who fail trying again and earning their degree in a later year. The effect with us on the number of men obtaining honors has been notable. Last year it grew to 38.4 per cent. There is still a possibility of obtaining the lowest grade of honors by rank in courses, but the number who attain honors in this way is diminishing. This year the number of men who were awarded honors for marks in courses was only 7.3 per cent of the students graduating, while 31.1 per cent obtained them through the general examination. The large increase in the number of men seeking and attaining honors seems to show that the plan of a general examination and tutors for all has had an effect on the attitude of the student body towards scholarship. It is notable also that at the meeting this autumn of the Association of New England Colleges the three other institutions which have required the general examination for all students reported that it had caused a distinct increase of seriousness in the senior year. The scale on which our general examinations are conducted has now become impressive, especially as compared with those colleges in which it has been optional for high grade students. At Swarthmore, for example, 166 students have so far been examined; at Columbia not over two hundred and fifty bachelors of arts; and as most of the other colleges have adopted the plan recently, the total outside Harvard does not probably exceed a few hundred. With us the

number of candidates examined through last June was 5,663. Certainly, if we are doing nothing else, we are learning not a little about these examinations.

Another measure for promoting the sense of self-education is that of the reading periods, which have had a curious history,—as in many cases the by-product attracting more attention than the main object. We found that our teachers were hard pressed, and especially the tutors. A professor, for example, told me that with the improvement in scholarship his lectures followed by class discussion had to be prepared with more care than formerly, and that it took him decidedly more time. The tutors also found that they were called upon by their pupils at all hours, leaving little leisure for their own work; and we feared that they would be tempted away to places where the requirements for teaching were less and hence the opportunity for research greater. We determined, therefore, to reduce the teaching period for all but elementary courses to about that of a European university—roughly, twenty-four weeks—and to use the rest of the term time, not taken up with examinations, for student reading periods. We then found that these periods were good for the students also,—especially, of course, for the better students, but to some extent for all, by causing them to work by themselves and thus understand better the nature of self-education. The periods are taken on the whole seriously, intercollegiate contests and outside activities being cut down by the students themselves.

The object of all these things, none of which alone might have much effect, is to produce a new atmosphere and attitude towards all college work; and this brings us to the question of the Houses. One can easily see how the closer contact of the students with the teachers, and especially the tutors with whom they are already on friendly terms, would naturally be increased by bringing them all into a community united by a common life. To meet one's tutor in his office, and still better in his room in one of the college buildings, brings a pleasant and stimulating relation; but much more is that which comes from living in a household to which both belong, where one may meet him at table or in the lounge. The aim of the Houses is to become an academic society, where the students are thrown not only with the mem-

bers of the teaching staff but also the older with the younger, the sophomores, juniors and seniors together. Class spirit has been a great force in the American college, and in later years a source of attachment to the university and of revenue; but it has had a disadvantage in segregating the younger men from the influence of the older ones. The sophomore has much to learn, and with contact will learn much, from upper-classmen; and in the experience we have had so far the tone given to the House by the seniors is notable in the decorum that prevails.

Each House is organized with a master at its head and a body of tutors,—the unmarried ones having suites therein where they live, those who are married and live away, rooms where they meet their pupils; the students in each House being assigned so far as possible to the tutors connected therewith. Of course at first this last cannot be carried out with anything like completeness because the men already have tutors assigned on no such plan. Then there is a small body of associates—older members of the faculty—belonging to each House who have the privileges of its table and its common room and who come there frequently. Membership on the part of the students is voluntary, with the natural result that at first some upper-classmen, who have been living elsewhere and have formed their associations, will prefer to stay where they are, and the plan will not be complete at once. But eventually the advantage of the conditions will bring all men into the Houses, and it would seem with the more enthusiasm because it is voluntary.

So far as residence is concerned, each House is self-sufficient. It has its own suites of rooms, its own dining and common rooms, its own library stocked both with the books likely to be needed in college work and with standard literature; and finally there is the master's house. The students are required to take, or rather are charged for, a minimum of one-half their meals in the House, and the master and tutors take many of their meals among them, mixing with the students in a quite informal way. In regard to some of these things, experiments are being tried. Of the two Houses already established, one has a high table and a separate common room for the tutors. On Monday evenings there is a high table dinner, to which distinguished outsiders are invited, as well as a number of undergraduates. The other

House has a master of more democratic leanings, who does not want these things. Which the students will, in the long run, like better, which will have the better effect, remains to be seen; for the whole matter is important only as an expression, better or less good, of the community life.

Thus the Houses are far more than a method of housing. They are attempts to form communities which will embody and promote the spirit that we have been trying to introduce into the college. We believe they will make the undergraduates feel themselves members of an association whose object is their education, or rather, providing them with an environment conducive to their educating themselves; and the college a place where scholars may not only be listened to in the classroom, but conversed with informally, in an atmosphere challenging discussion and thought on the part of all capable of profiting by a university education. For us the time was ripe for the House plan. It is an experiment, of course, but an experiment not in housing, but in the conditions of serious self-education.

Perhaps you may think I have said little about the Houses, and much about other things; but in fact I have been talking about the Houses all the time.

The entire object of true education is to make people not merely do the right things, but to enjoy the right things—not merely industrious, but to love industry—not merely learned, but to love knowledge—not merely pure, but to love purity—not merely just, but to hunger and thirst after justice.—*John Ruskin*.

MASS EDUCATION AT COLLEGE LEVEL

KERR D. MACMILLAN

PRESIDENT OF WELLS COLLEGE

THE title of my paper, "Mass Education at College Level," at once suggests *Class Size at the College Level*, the title of the volume in which Professor Hudelson and his colleagues published the results of their experiments with classes of various sizes in the University of Minnesota. It was impossible for me to escape the conclusion that our Executive Committee in laying the title before me was requesting me to review this book, and to do so from the standpoint of an outsider and as a representative of a small college. I could not refuse, both because the word of our Committee is law and because this Association should not allow the contents of this volume to go without special attention.

May I assume that you are more or less familiar with it? For those who are not, let me say in a word, that it is an effort to find by carefully controlled experiment whether large or small classes are better, and that the evidence points to the conclusion that there is no advantage to the student in a small class, and that if there be advantage either way it is probably to those in the larger class.

Now this is so contrary to what we have all been thinking and saying that our first inclination is to deny it, to take advantage of the editor's confession of uncertainty, to point out that several important subjects, such as mathematics and foreign languages, were not included, and let it go at that. But I am not going to do anything so small. On the contrary I believe that these experiments are not only very valuable but a real necessity if the University of Minnesota and other large American universities are to carry on the work committed to them in the best and most economical manner.

Just think of the setting: an institution with nearly 10,000 enrolled students in 1922-23. Of these there were lost 1,659, or over 18 per cent, during the year, not counting those who were graduated. Also, of its entering students only 25 per cent graduated at the end of four years. Some others of them kept

returning until after nine years about 52 per cent had taken a degree. They also knew that the number of students would in all likelihood increase during the next decades. And in addition to all this they knew that similar conditions existed elsewhere in universities all over the United States, that students had increased in a quarter of a century from 168,000 in 1900 to 664,000 in 1924. And they suspected what we now know to be true, that a similarly rapid increase would continue. They have increased one hundred per cent in the last decade.

With such appalling figures before them what did they do? Did they thank God that so many fell by the wayside? Not they; they lamented that the University had not been able to hold them and took thought how this might be accomplished. Did they declare that too many students were seeking a college education? Not they; though they were aware others were saying so. Did they seek to raise the barriers of entrance, to limit the number of the freshmen class, to "drop" a definite proportion at the end of the first semester and so reduce the numbers? Not they; they accepted the task in all its immensity and with all its manifold ramifications. They even looked into the future when the University would be still larger and still more complex, and they set themselves to the task of finding the best way to educate this horde. For the experiments in class size are only one item of their inquiry, others are outlined in another volume entitled *Problems of College Education* and the investigations are only begun.

To me there is something grand about this and I compliment the University of Minnesota on it. But I do not stop there. I compliment rather the genius of the American people. (May I remind you that I am not American born, and therefore what I say cannot in any way be taken as spread-eagleism?) For both this huge number of students presenting themselves at the doors of our colleges and universities, and the matter of fact way in which they are received and offered the best, are only one way in which the American people are expressing their determination to give equality of opportunity to all. First of all, but not so long ago, we had the public schools and compulsory attendance, then the high schools, also compulsory, with the leaving age rising ever higher, and now we are seeing the results, the ripe

fruit of this program. Our young men and young women, not by legal compulsion, but by force of habit, of public opinion, of their own judgment of what is best for them, are crowding our institutions of higher learning in a manner never known before in any part of the world.

There is something magnificent about it all and if our universities can contrive to carry them through a four year or even a two year course the good results will be incalculable. For it is during these years of early maturity that they can be brought into touch with the problems of their own generation. Our undergraduate course is nothing but an apprenticeship for life in general. There are a few specialists everywhere, but the great mass of students do not get very far into anything in particular. They touch lightly and yet sensibly a great many things in general, scientific, historical, social, religious, artistic, political, national and international, a broad and serviceable foundation.

We need not apologize for this. To those who compare the product of the American college unfavorably with the graduates of the European institutions it should be a sufficient answer that the American program differs fundamentally from those over seas. We are committed to the theory of educating a whole people without distinction of class or wealth, and we are making considerable progress in doing so. By our system of public schools we have already banished that curious combination of superstition, ignorance, good nature, conservatism and lack of sensibility well known on the other side as the "peasant mind," and this in spite of the fact that so many millions afflicted with it were dumped on our shores. To have done that with the lower reaches of our school system is sufficient warrant for continuing the experiment of general education in the institutions of higher learning, not only accepting all that come to them but even going out and beating the bushes for them, and haling them in.

Of course all this involves a philosophy or theory of education which I find both stated and implied in the publications of the University of Minnesota. It is to the effect that the chief duty and aim of education is to pass on to the next generation the accumulated wisdom of the past and the present. I agree with this heartily. The great mass of men are sufficiently intelligent

to carry on. Only Prometheus could steal the fire of the gods but anybody, even the Vestal Virgins, could keep it burning. There was only one Alexander Graham Bell but everybody can use the telephone. Only Woodrow Wilson could call into being the League of Nations but nations and individuals can learn to keep it alive.

The average individual can be trained and, in a democracy such as ours professes to be, where the only distinction is that of personal worth, the average individual should be given such an apprentice training as will enable him to carry on as journeyman citizen. It is in this faith that the University of Minnesota is working out the best way to educate her thousands and tens of thousands, and I, for one, wish her God-speed.

But when that is said and done, I have to pause and confess that, although I read carefully the account of the experiments in Minnesota, I found in them nothing, or practically nothing, to aid me in the problems of my own College. For one thing, their small sections were just about the average size of our large classes, from twenty-five to thirty. Classes such as we consider small, from one to five, apparently do not come under their purview at all. My first impulse was to confess our insignificance and uselessness. Compared with the enormous work they are doing, and their apparently successful experiment with sections running from twelve to 169, how can we justify the existence of a whole college for only 250 students? Why maintain a faculty of forty for that inconsiderable number? Why continue teaching, year after year, some seventy classes in which there are five or fewer students? It all seems so small and feeble. It certainly is uneconomical. Is it not futile as well?

And then I took heart for I remembered that we had both a poet and a prophet on our side. Wordsworth, writing of the vaulted beauty of the Chapel of King's College, an institution of only 150 students, says:

Tax not the royal Saint with vain expense,
With ill matched aims the Architect who planned,—
Albeit laboring for a scanty band
Of white robed scholars only,—this immense
And glorious work of fine intelligence—
Give all thou canst; high Heaven rejects the lore
Of nicely calculated less or more.

A "scanty band" describes us exactly, and I took courage. Then I was still more heartened when I found the paraphrase of "high Heaven rejects the lore Of nicely calculated less or more" by one of heaven's modern educational prophets. For Professor Whitehead says:

Culture is activity of thought and receptiveness to beauty and human feelings. Scraps of information have nothing to do with it. A merely well informed man is the most useless bore on God's earth. What we should aim at producing is men who possess both culture and expert knowledge in some special direction. Their expert knowledge will give them the ground to start from and their culture will lead them as deep as philosophy and as high as art. We have to remember that the valuable intellectual development is self development and that it mostly takes place between the ages of sixteen and thirty.

Professor Whitehead, you see, does not think in terms of masses and optimum classes, but of single individuals. Not only that, but he thinks that the individual is responsible for his own education.

We should face the fact squarely that there are these two philosophies of education in our midst, the one exemplified by the University of Minnesota, the other taught by the English trained Harvard professor and practised in quite a number of our colleges. Also I think we would do well not to argue which of these is right and which wrong, but rather to recognize that both are right, and both necessary if we are to carry through the program of education implied in American institutions. The mass education of our great universities will never produce the cultured individual Professor Whitehead has in mind. A few such may come out of them but it will be in spite of rather than because of what they received there. What these great institutions by this method will turn out will be masses of well informed men and women, the kind of person that Professor Whitehead says is the greatest bore on God's earth, but a well informed bore makes a much better citizen of a democracy than an ignorant one.

We have, I say, two perfectly good kinds of education in our country, each with its appropriate philosophy and practise, each doing its bit in the program we have laid before us. Indeed, I

am doubtful whether we should stop at two. For it appears to me that the task of universal education which we have undertaken is so vast, so complex, dealing with so many students, of all ages, with so many objects, purposes and methods, that one cannot but wonder whether it is possible to subsume them under only two categories. At all events when I read some of our modern critics of American education who quarrel with everything that does not conform to their own standard, instead of being gravely impressed I find Kipling's ribald answer to his critics running in my head:

There are nine and sixty ways of singing tribal ways
And every single one of them is—right.

By some strange coincidence, which cannot be accidental, the rapid increase in the number of our college students falls just at the time when other economic factors call for a broader educational program. Professor Ogburn has just told us that before long our modern civilization will be so complicated that the average man will need twice the training he now receives and remain an infant until forty. In the nearer future we are hoping to see some realignment of work time and leisure time with some better method of distributing the products of our labor. As never before in the world's history we see the possibility of banishing poverty, as never before we see the technical possibility of distributing to all not only the necessities of life but its comforts and, in particular, a share in the higher intellectual, aesthetic and spiritual experiences which have formerly been the possession of the very few. We do not want our masses to degenerate to the level of Romans yelling for bread and circuses, we do not want them to spend their leisure in hundreds of thousands cheering a ball game or following breathlessly the fortunes of a Hollywood screen star. And if they are to take their proper places in this very complicated international civilization, if they are to take an intelligent and interested part in the higher reaches of human life and human endeavor, they must be trained thereto by our colleges and universities.

That is our challenge. That is the opportunity that is standing at our threshold. It is a very large and varied problem, and it would be unwise to restrict it to any one or two theories

of education. It will require a great deal of experimentation before its final philosophy can be written. So let us experiment. Indeed, we are already doing so. The University of Minnesota is only one of many state institutions doing a big job well; the municipal universities are growing both in numbers and in appreciation of their responsibility for the general education of their cities. Adult education, summer schools, alumni reading, night schools, extension courses, correspondence courses, junior colleges, senior colleges, these are a few names that remind us that we have already made a beginning. Let us continue. Of course we shall make mistakes and, as always, some charlatans will find their way in, but if we have sufficient faith in ourselves and our institutions both errors and chicanery may be turned to good account.

However, in this paper I must confine myself to the two theories mentioned; the mass method and the individual method. The University of Minnesota thinks that the passing on of information to the next generation is the major part of education. I agree. I am willing even to say that it constitutes ninety, or even ninety-five, per cent of it. For that I take to be about the proportion of our race capable of doing nothing more than carrying on. But I am tremendously interested in the other five or ten per cent because they are the ones upon whom we must rely to bring our fire down from heaven. They are our leaders in science, art, religion, political and social problems. Until very recently they have received no attention and even now are not being sought out, introduced to themselves as prospective leaders and given the opportunities for development they should have. I want to see Prometheus unbound.

Some of our colleges have been playing around the outskirts of this problem. We have admitted students only after scrutinizing them very carefully by means of intelligence tests, the College Entrance Examination Board's examinations, the opinion of their former teachers, etc. After they are admitted we endeavor by various devices to induce them to regard their education as their own job and not the teacher's. We encourage them to do supplementary reading, to work by themselves with the least aid from a teacher. We attach them to individual members of the faculty, we establish special honors courses for

them, we have introduced for them a new kind of examination unfortunately named "comprehensive," we have brought in outside examiners. We allow them to do four years' work in three, and we gather all, even to the last least item of information about them, in a personnel office where it is always at the disposal of deans and members of the faculty interested in them.

The colleges expressing their faith in the individual student in this way are as a rule small, privately controlled institutions, but Harvard, with its thousands, has not only dared to make a similar profession but, step by step, reorganized its undergraduate college, introducing degrees with distinction after comprehensive examinations, revamping its method of teaching, compelling the student to do independent work and, last of all, breaking up its student body into groups of about 250 each. Now we are informed that another of our larger institutions has been converted and intends to work out its salvation in its own way. In the University of Chicago the students may proceed as fast as they can, in months or years each according to his several ability, with an intermediate and final comprehensive examination as the tests. We are anxious to see how these principles are worked into the machinery of the University.

Those of us who are familiar with the methods of the British Universities, Oxford and Cambridge, recognize that all of this new machinery has been borrowed from them, though with some adaptations to American conditions. It is quite proper that this be so, for just as America has made a special study of the education of the masses to the neglect of the more gifted, so Great Britain has given special thought to training its leaders to the neglect of public education. We may each learn from the other. And in particular we should be glad to have available in our own language the rich literature of their experience and the cooperation which they have always been willing to give.

May I spend the remainder of my paper in examining some of the difficulties connected with the individualistic method of teaching as they have emerged in connection with our experience with it in Wells College?

The first of these is the difficulty of finding the more gifted student early. At present we use the College Entrance Board examinations, intelligence tests and school records. But even

with all these we feel that there are some who escape our net. We are continually brought face to face with the fact that students of outstanding ability come to us with a minimum of schooling and discipline, with a lack of interest in anything academic and with a positive distaste or even contempt for serious mental work; and with a well developed taste for frivolous things. The explanation of this, I believe, is that these students, with their superior ability, have always, from the time they first sat with other children, found they could do the task of the class without much effort or spending much time on it. This has led them rather to despise such things for it did not enlist their best ability. Also it left them with considerable time on their hands which the devil took charge of in his usual manner. By the time they have passed through ten or twelve years of this it is difficult and often impossible to reclaim them for anything better. They lack interest, training, respect for hard work, and they have a very positive liking for football, bridge and the movies. Of all the methods we have tried to bring them to their senses perhaps the most effective is to throw them entirely on their own resources, giving them a good stiff piece of work to do over a considerable period of time without the detracting influence of classes, quizzes, etc. We call it a period of independent study and it comes twice a year about three weeks at a time. Last year one of our seniors who had not been at all noted for her attention to her studies but had been into everything else, burst into my office with a request for a position on the faculty. She said she had discovered English literature, that it was perfectly wonderful and that she felt she must teach it to others.

But the senior year is too late for students of good calibre to find themselves, or be found by others. They should be discovered before they enter college and I think there is a practical way of doing it. Let our high schools in the first place, using the apparatus of intelligence tests and school marks, segregate these better students and give them superior expert attention, with work to do that commands all their respect and all their energies. Then let the College Entrance Examination Board prepare advanced papers and examine them as candidates for honors or for special consideration of some sort. And, in the

third place, let our colleges erect special courses for them, not only in the upper classes as now, but through all four years. In some such way as this these superior students will be kept at their best from their early high school years to the end of their college course.

The chief difficulty in putting this program into operation would probably be found in the high schools, but it should not be insuperable. Additional state aid might be secured for this purpose. Some of our colleges, too, might find it difficult to introduce the courses indicated, but the rapidity with which special honors courses have been taken up in the last few years indicates that this also might spread with unexpected rapidity. Fortunately there is no doubt of the ability of the College Entrance Examination Board to perform its part of the task. Its long experience, the universal respect in which it is held, the universal recognition accorded its examinations by American colleges and universities in every part of the Union point to it as the logical clearing house between the schools and colleges in such a program as this.

The second problem I wish to mention is the method of teaching. I do not need to remind you that faculties are less flexible than students, and that it is very difficult for an old teacher to learn new methods. And yet if we are to throw the responsibility of their education upon the students, which is the only way in which they can be educated as Professor Whitehead reminds us, we must give up teaching in our old American sense of the word: *i.e.*, setting daily tasks, seeing they are performed, holding quizzes, correcting errors and informing ignorance. We must find the way to throw all these, or almost all, back upon the student himself. I suppose it is an open secret that both in Princeton and more recently in Harvard, when a tutorial system was introduced, things did not at first proceed as was hoped and predicted. Our American students are accustomed to get their information from their teachers, and the teacher is accustomed to give it to them. Such habits are hard to break and even when the new fangled preceptor or tutor had the best of intentions the boys would worm it out of him. For a discussion group or a conference or a seminar if not properly handled may degenerate into something worse than a formal lecture. The

best illustration of what I am trying to say comes from President Lowell. Describing their difficulties and their study of English methods he summed it up thus: "In America when a boy asks his teacher anything, the teacher tells him the answer; in Oxford when a boy asks his tutor anything, the tutor looks at him." President Hutchins also is apparently aware that the new program in Chicago calls not only for a new kind of student but also for a new kind of teacher. If both Chicago and Harvard can find sufficient men and women of the right sort, the results will soon be felt not merely within their own halls but in every institution where their graduates are found.

One of our difficulties just now is to find enough teachers who have the ability, the training and above all the rich personality necessary to inspire and guide a young man or woman of superior mental calibre. It is not necessary for the teacher always to have greater native ability than his student but he should at least be sufficiently gifted to recognize exceptional ability and respect it. I have known cases where this was not so but the teacher's reaction was distrust and suspicion. In addition to native ability the teacher should also be well informed in his own field, its literature, its present problems and its relation to other fields and to life in general. He should also be sympathetic and interested in the work of the student and in the student himself, for only so can he guide him correctly in his process of self education.

This kind of teacher is hard to find and our American institutions are not doing enough to find and keep them. For consider what we do to one of our first class students whom we would like to have on the faculty. After his first degree we send him to a graduate school, perhaps on scholarship, generally with barely enough to live on, for three years. Then we take him on as instructor with an instructor's salary and keep him there for another three years, shall we say, then through the other grades until such time as he is full professor, with the salary of one. Now there are few young men of first class ability willing or able to go through with this. They have better opportunities in other professions or businesses, and even though they set out sturdily enough, not many reach the goal. We cannot, of course, compete financially with some careers but we should do

better than this. After they have been in our hands for four years we should be able to tell whether we want them or not and if we do we should give them such a position and emoluments as would make it easy for them to accept. One of the striking differences between ourselves and our English cousins, and one of the reasons for their sturdy traditions, is that they take a young first class man and put him immediately on a par with the senior fellows. They trust their men and their machine as we do not.

Still another problem is that of testing these better students. The teacher and the pupil must work together, each doing his share, if this sort of education is to be a success. The pupil cannot go alone without advice and the teacher should give him that and nothing more. The test of this team work which has been set up over seas and copied here is the comprehensive examination given by some body or commission,—not the pupil's teacher. There seems to be a lack of understanding, or a least a lack of unanimity as to what the comprehensive examination is and I would like to say just a word about it as I understand it. It is not, as its name might imply, merely an examination on a larger amount of work than others, not even, as one recent writer understands, one that covers both the ground of the class room work and that of private supplementary reading and study. It is more even than this. Or, better, it is a different kind of examination from those ordinarily given. Our ordinary examinations are designed to find out what a student knows. The new comprehensive examination assumes that he knows the ground covered and proceeds to inquire how he can use this information. It is primarily a test of power, not of knowledge. Surely, after we have had a student, especially a good one, on our hands for four years and have tested him with the ordinary methods of quizzes, conferences, papers and lesser examinations, we may assume that he has a sufficient lot of facts. The old final examination did nothing but confirm this. The new kind erects questions which test not only his memory of facts but also his ability to view them when taken together, when brought into relation with another set of facts.

As a corollary let me add that the student should be given a wide variety of choice of questions and should be marked solely

on what he says and not on what he omits. A very good example that I saw recently laid sixteen questions before the student and told him to choose not more than four. If I had had the marking of the paper I should not have taken it amiss if he chose to spend the entire time on one of them, provided he showed good ability and used all the time allowed.

Closely allied to this is the problem of securing suitable examiners. For the most part our American colleges are stuck in the rut of having the teacher examine his own students. We do not permit it for a higher degree and no over seas institution permits it even for the first degree. Surely we do not need to be told that it is impossible for any one to examine his own students impartially in the upper ranges of learning. The examiner who thinks he can be perfectly impartial is the worst of all. Surely it is unnecessary to point out that if the student knows his teacher will also be his examiner he will study the teacher more than the subject, and the teacher's own views more than the larger aspects of the subject. There is a wall of separation between them. But let both teacher and pupil know that the examining board is outside and over and above them, and they will unite as a team to explore the subject matter of the examination in all its phases.

But how are we to get these outside examiners? I know one institution which gave up the outside examining commission simply because it could not find them. In a large institution like Harvard they can make up a commission out of their own faculty without bringing in the teacher but we lesser folk cannot do that. Our experience at Wells College has been as follows: we have frankly written to members of faculties of other institutions, choosing when possible those who had come through a similar mill either here or abroad, told them of our experiment, said we would pay their expenses and a small honorarium and asked them if they would aid us. And never yet have we had a refusal except once when other duties prevented an acceptance. But this is not a permanently satisfactory arrangement. I am hoping that when a sufficient number of institutions have introduced the comprehensive examinations and have learned how to give them and evaluate them, we may arrange between institutions an exchange of faculty members for the purpose of final comprehensive examinations.

And finally, there is a larger and more evident problem than any of these; namely, that in every one of our institutions, large and small, we have both kinds of students, those who are capable only of carrying on and those better ones whom we are anxious to train for better things. Not only is this the case now but in all likelihood it will continue to be so. Are we to continue, as we have in the past, serving the same pabulum to all, even though we have a vision of something better? Surely not, for Gresham's law applies to students as well as coins, the bad will drive out the good. Only with the human beings the result will be worse than with metal. The good student will not be driven out but he will fall lower than the bad one. He will continue in college, but not as a student. He will lack interest in intellectual matters. He will despise the grind. He will play with his studies and work at his extra-curricular interests. He will perpetuate the evils we are trying to exorcise. The only correct thing for us to do is to face these facts squarely and make the division or the divisions necessary in the student body and in the methods of teaching and examining. Fortunately we have several very good examples in the English-speaking world upon which to base our experiment. In Oxford some colleges accept only the superior students who announce themselves candidates for the degree with honors. Those who cannot or will not attempt this will find accommodation in other colleges. It will be interesting to see if this will be followed by Harvard which is now breaking up its students into groups about the same size as the English colleges.

Another possible method is to encourage and invite the foundation of a society or fraternity of honor students which would house both students and tutors. I am not sure but some of the problems of our fraternities would disappear if they could be reborn with this idea.

And for those of you who are interested in the problem and are not familiar with the work of the University of Toronto I would commend a study of that institution. Its problems are very similar to those of our state universities. It, too, is a provincial institution. It, too, has its thousands of students. And yet it has very cleverly adapted the English pass and honors courses to American ideals and conditions. The students are

admitted at two levels, that of the pass matriculation and that of the honors matriculation. The student who enters with honors may immediately proceed with honors work through his four years, and when he reaches his final examination he has had considerably more and better training than the student in the pass course. Yet all this is done without the English machinery of separate small colleges, or the tutorial system, or outside examining commissions. Provision is also made for a weak honor student to fall back into the pass course and for the clever pass student to be advanced to honors. They handle the two kinds very successfully without either crowding the other out. We might do well to profit from the experience and spare ourselves unnecessary experimenting.

A JUDGE'S "CONFESSION OF FAITH"

But if he is a man of high ambitions he must leave even his fellow adventurers and go forth into a deeper solitude and greater trials. He must start for the pole. In plain words, he must face the loneliness of original work. No one can cut out new paths in company. He does that alone. He knows now what he had divined at the outset, that one part of the universe yields the same teaching as any other if only it is mastered, that the difference between the great way of taking things and the small, between philosophy and gossip, is only the difference between realizing the part as a part of a whole and looking at it in its isolation as if it really stood apart.

I care not very much for the form if in some way he has learned that he cannot set himself over against the universe as a rival God, to criticize it, or to shake his fist at the skies, but that his meaning is its meaning, his only worth is as a part of it, as a humble instrument of the universal power. It seems to me that this is the key to intellectual salvation, as the key to happiness is to accept a like faith in one's heart, and to be not merely a necessary but a willing instrument, in working out the inscrutable end.—*Oliver Wendell Holmes:*

COLLEGE MEN IN BUSINESS

R. I. REES

ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH
COMPANY

IN a paper which I recently read before the Association of State Universities on the needs of business for college graduates, an attempt was made from the rather meager information available to set up a demand. The most recent data came from a study which is now in progress by a committee of the American Management Association, of which the speaker is chairman. A limited view of the situation is at present available from certain industries. From those who supplied the information requested, we find the total annual requirements for recent college graduates to be about one thousand graduates of colleges of liberal arts, about eleven hundred men with training in business administration, and nearly seven thousand men with training in engineering. These figures compare with 27,000 men receiving arts and science degrees in 1928, 5,500 receiving degrees in commerce, and less than 8,000 receiving degrees in engineering.

In total, the industries represented employ about 3,000,000 workers, or about 15 per cent of all workers engaged in industry, excluding agriculture, trade and the professions. It would be unjust to take this percentage as a basis for calculation of the total demand, because the organizations which have replied to our questionnaire are undoubtedly those most interested in college graduate employment. Moreover, the large majority of the industries interested in the study are highly technical in character and, as a consequence show what might be considered a disproportionate demand for men trained in engineering.

From an over-all quantitative point of view, the study as thus far developed, seems to indicate that the future demands of business and the professions for college graduates can be rather well filled by the number of men now graduating from college. But there seem to be real opportunities for more engineers than are graduating today.

As the demand for engineers seems, on the basis of this report, excessive, so does the more limited demand for graduates of the

arts and sciences seem less than should normally be the case. The character of many industries not reporting would seem to indicate a clearer field for the employment of college men. Even in a technical industry such as the one to which I belong, there has been a steady but consistent growth in the demand for graduates of liberal arts colleges. At present, the number of these graduates employed annually approaches 50 per cent of the total. This compares with about 30 per cent eight or ten years ago.

The annual demand for 1,000 liberal arts graduates set up by the industries replying to the American Management Association's questionnaire could easily be increased eight-fold when such fields of business as finance, advertising, retailing, and accounting are considered. The absorption of this number of liberal arts graduates in business and industry seems to bear a proper relation to the large demands of the professions such as teaching, law, medicine, and the like.

However, it is not the quantitative aspects of the demand for college graduates that I wish to speak of today, but rather to discuss briefly the place of the college man in business and industry. And in this discussion I should like to restrict the definition of the college man to the graduate of the liberal arts college; his contribution to business and industry, and in general, to our present social order.

The liberal arts colleges of the great universities have turned out great men, but in no less degree is the nation indebted to the small college for furnishing leadership to the upbuilding of our American civilization. Let us name a few taken at random. Calvin Coolidge, Amherst, statesman; Newton D. Baker, Washington and Lee, lawyer and statesman; Dwight W. Morrow, Amherst, financier and statesman; Charles E. Hughes, Brown, jurist and statesman; Robert A. Millikan, Oberlin, scientist; and finally, in business, Owen D. Young, St. Lawrence, and Walter S. Gifford, Harvard, industrial statesmen. Can there be any doubt that the college is discharging its trust in giving background to such leaders?

But let us take a closer view of the manner in which the liberal arts graduate fits into business and industry. I do not believe I could better picture the prospective careers of young

college men in business than to show how they have in the past gained recognition and assumed large responsibilities in the nation-wide industry to which I belong. The liberal arts college has given to this industry the President of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company and Presidents of six of our seventeen associated operating companies. Throughout the Bell System, eighteen of the Vice Presidents are graduates of the liberal arts college. Large numbers of the higher staff are college graduates, but turning to the more purely operating functions of the business, we find arts graduates playing the rôle of General Manager, General Commercial Manager, General Traffic Manager, General Auditor, General Plant Manager. These are positions of the highest operating responsibility, and the number of liberal arts graduates occupying these positions totals thirty-three. It would be unbecoming in me, an engineer trained, to fail to include in this enumeration the fact that two of our Chief Engineers are graduates of colleges of liberal arts. Furnishing this fair proportion of high executives means that there are numbers of liberal arts graduates continually coming up through the lines of supervision and executive control, side by side with the engineer and the commerce man, and winning their spurs on their merits. I could not say positively that we would find in industry generally that the liberal arts graduate is assuming his full share of high executive responsibility, but it is my impression that investigations of other organizations would prove such to be the case. Is the achievement of the liberal arts graduate in this field due to the background, breadth of vision, and flexibility which you have given him during his undergraduate work? I feel that you can claim your full share in his development.

In our conscious selection of the graduates of colleges, we continually look for the student's objective as indicated in the courses pursued through his undergraduate years. We should like to discover that the student in his selection of courses has a clear idea of the contribution which his undergraduate work is going to make to his future life's career. In an industry such as ours, we are always interested in graduates who have grouped their studies around a major in economics. It seems to indicate that they will be interested in the financial factors of the busi-

ness and will be qualified for an initial start in the commercial and accounting phases of operations, and for human control over large numbers of workers such as obtains in our traffic department. In like manner, we are interested in young men who have given the major portion of their time and attention to the mastery of pure science, mathematics, physics, and chemistry. Men with this background, particularly if they have done some graduate work, early show their value in industrial research and development. In this endeavor they work with the engineer, and it is interesting to observe how well the young men equipped with the fundamentals of pure science complement the work of the engineer.

Do not these concrete illustrations, in which we try to determine the interests of prospective graduate employees on the basis of those demonstrated by their choice of a curriculum, indicate that it is fully as important that the student in the liberal arts college have as clear-cut a career objective as those in more specialized types of higher education? Of course, all those matriculated for pre-professional training have such an objective, but it is a sad situation, with so many students whose A.B. degree is the terminal point in their formal education, that such large numbers of them, when interviewed in the final semester of their senior years, have no idea what they want to do.

There is much of encouragement in the direction of clarifying objectives through the development of measures of vocational guidance. The speaker must admit a feeling of repugnance toward the word 'guidance,' used in this sense. The word 'counselling' which is growing in use, seems a better term, and I should be inclined to go even further and stake the determination of the interests of our young Americans on vocational exposure. Contacts with many of life's vocations during grade and high school, will determine for the boy and girl on their own initiative, the field in which their deepest interests lie. There have come to us in industry indications in many cases of young men who have been educated away from their deepest interests, inducing maladjustments and difficulties which retard the real growth and progress of the individual. Two fundamentals which I am sure industry deems most vital in its selection of

men, are interest and capacity. There seems good evidence that aptitude and adaptability go where interest lies. In the field of human endeavor, interest shows what a man should do, and capacity will indicate how far he can go. It is hoped that psychologists will give more and more emphasis to the determination and measurement of these two fundamental human characteristics. It would be an enormous relief to representatives of industries whose responsibilities are the employment of college men, to find upon interview, that the prospective graduate has a clear-cut objective.

Another movement on college campuses which is giving great encouragement to industry, is the increasing attention being accorded the individual student and his affairs, through the establishment of personnel departments. In this closest point of impact between industry and the colleges, it is ordinarily the personnel representatives of industry who are interested in the employment of college men. It is a great aid to industrial representatives to deal with a similar organization within the colleges which have as much interest in the placement of graduates as industry has in their employment. These personnel departments we find, are building up a body of information about the individual students which is of inestimable value to industrial representatives in the selection process. College personnel officers also, are most helpful to representatives of industry in organizing the procedure of contact and interview with the prospective graduates.

As an outsider, watching the struggle of the colleges to adjust themselves to an ever-changing social order, the speaker feels no call to join the clamor of criticism of the college, which has been so much the mode during recent years. Intimate contact with educational institutions leads him to the conviction that the college faculties, with an ever-growing impetus, are leading not following, in whatever corrective influence is needed to place the colleges in the forefront of service to our American civilization. Dr. Flexner, with all his strictures on present conditions in the colleges, recognizes the march of progress. No one can read Dean Johnson's inspiring book pointing away from institutionalism and toward attention to the student, without recognizing that this, in itself, is directed toward the growth and

development of the individual capacity of the student in accordance with his deepest interest.

Let us hope that the experiment of Dr. Meiklejohn at Wisconsin will lead to a realization from the student that he is gaining background and vision to deal with the social problems in life. The highly endowed universities can afford to experiment and thus lead the way to broader developments in higher education. Let us bow in respect to the courage of President Hutchins in undertaking what are almost revolutionary changes in the reorganization of the curriculum at the University of Chicago. Let us also express our admiration to Dr. Angell, who at Yale, through his Institute of Human Relations, is attempting a coordination of the physical and social sciences into an integration for the welfare of mankind. One could go on enumerating the fine effort of many colleges, forward-looking and strengthening, in the realm of higher education.

However, you are now thinking that the cobbler is not sticking to his last, and that it is unbecoming in a layman to make general expression before this body on problems in higher education, so I shall come abruptly back to my subject, with the question, What are the most serious present and future problems which the college man in business must face and solve? It has been stated so often that it has become a truism, that science and engineering have solved the problems of production. Mass production has increased the capacity of plants far beyond present consumptive demand. It is a queer anomaly that our present economic depression is due primarily, to a surplus of everything, manufactured goods and raw materials. It seems a fair statement, held by many economists, that there can be no real over-production as long as the wants of man remain unsatisfied. As President Glenn Frank has so ably stated in his masterful paper "The Economic Impasse of the Western World," our machine order was never more efficient from the point of view of productive capacity, but our economic order has found itself swamped rather than served, by the efficiency of the machine order. And I should like to add that our whole social order is threatened with disruption because of lack of coordination between these two. The trouble is that physical science has far out-stripped the science of man. The pressing

problems in business then, which are facing the college man in business, have now to do with human relationships rather than with material things. The understanding of man must be attacked and developed in the same scientific spirit that has impelled physicists and engineers in their attack on the forces of nature.

What does this mean in terms of education? It means that education must equip the potential industrial leader with a fundamental knowledge of biology, psychology, sociology, economics, and yes, the humanities; for real vision, which will reveal a solution of our present difficulties, must grow out of the history and past experiences of our people. Do not these subjects read like the curriculum of a liberal arts college? Must we not use them in the solution of the problems of our contemporary civilization? Was there ever a time when there was a more acute challenge to the vital leadership of the faculties of the liberal arts college to point the way out of this morass in which we find ourselves, by commanding government, business, and industry to the knowledge of human conduct and control? This can only come about through your teaching of the nature of men and the right and just relations, social and economic, which should exist among them. Social consciousness, which is developing brilliantly among the few in industrial leadership, is what is most needed of all leaders.

And should not the faculties of liberal arts colleges inspire the young potential leaders under their charge with a spirit of a new philosophy which we are just beginning to recognize? From a philosophy of religion and simple faith, we have been passing through a philosophy of despair, until in recent years, there seems to be developing a philosophy which urges the development of growth, achievement, high excellence, perfection. Give to your students high social consciousness, and an impelling urge for growth. There will then be no question of the success of the college man in business.

THE COLLEGE AS A CONSERVATOR OF THE BEST LITERATURE

JOSEPH WHARTON LIPPINCOTT

PRESIDENT OF THE J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY

PAST PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BOOK PUBLISHERS

I REALIZE what a privilege it is to address you on literature, a subject so intimately a part of the educational curriculum, and I can say that it is one close to my own heart. But it covers a wide and varied field and in limited time, can only, I fear, be given a study that touches the high spots.

At every opportunity, I acutely enjoy putting in a good word for any book of merit. Before the National Association of Book Publishers last year I deplored the failing interest in the English classics, intimating that some of these old treasures of literature would be dead were it not for the support of schools and colleges. The interest of the press was aroused and some entertainingly worded editorials resulted.

The *New York World* humorously decided that it was not only a matter of the public never buying enough old books, but that they do not buy enough *new* books either.

The *New York Times* said that if schools and colleges did not require acquaintance with standard literature they would not be educational institutions.

The *Peoria Journal* remarked very sagely that "in any case the main support of good literature is reader interest; if reader interest wanes, the classics will be driven inevitably into the protecting arms of colleges and universities, there to rest merely as relics of a former age." I took exception to this because the colleges are in a position to create reader interest, and I also remarked in a later address that there were some works of literature so fine that I would like to carry them even to Heaven with me; whereupon a bright friend in the *Daily Oklahoman* at once undertook to prepare a list of ten best books to be taken to Heaven. A wit who was asked in to help in their selection, said that the ten books he would like to take to Heaven would take him straight to Hell.

I did not see a single article that took exception to the idea that the colleges were, and should be, conservators of the best literature.

You will remember that Carlyle said the true university was a collection of books. Be that as it may, if it were not thoroughly hammered into the public's consciousness by schools and colleges that books mean education and general advancement; if it were not continually being told the youth by teachers and professors inside and outside the departments of English, that worth while books must be read, must be studied, there might not be much book publishing in the world except of cheap fiction.

In other words the great educational institutions are supporting serious reading, which is the backbone of publishing. Admitting that they start the reading habit, instil standards and turn out each year a rapidly increasing army of properly equipped book enthusiasts, universities and colleges already showing, I understand, an enrolment of around 800,000, and improved schools literally combing the whole country, should make the present illiteracy figure, which for really practical purposes may be estimated at between 15,000,000 and 20,000,000, of no further worry, even to the high minded among publishers. And eventually it must become true that scholars will rule the future.

But a little study of retail bookselling made a short time ago, revealed the fact that the public's reading tastes were undergoing a disturbing change. That, indeed, the flood of new books was swamping valued old standard titles and by sheer volume confusing critic and reader and preventing the better new books from being "found out" and reaching their proper place and sale.

The public was being educated in almost every direction to believe that the latest thing was the best; it tried to measure books by this standard. Many authors quickly met the changed circumstances by turning out two, three or even four new books each year instead of one, thus securing perhaps the same return that in years past would have come in the course of its longer life, from one carefully prepared volume per year. The life of a book grew shorter and shorter, until the average fiction, for example, became stale after about three weeks.

The bookseller was in a dilemma. With 10,184 new books in 1929, (the number was only 5741 in 1919) the 1930 total 10,027, and only so much space in his store and only just so many customers, he had to discard from his shelves very many of his old,

standard books. Reluctantly in most cases, he met the popular cry of the age by featuring the latest publications while not trying the impossible task of learning the relative value of each.

A hand to mouth buying policy soon resulted. No longer did the bookseller order from the publisher a hundred at a time of some fine standard book he was in the habit of selling consistently in the old days. It became a wild game of handing out volumes hot from the presses, unsorted, unseasoned stuff that in the end rarely pleased the customer.

Since all three had to live—author, publisher and retailer—they were being absorbed, swept off their feet by this vogue for the new. And the public was getting what it clamored for, but naturally was being disappointed in the quality. Publishers found one after another of their good, standard “bread and butter” books selling so few copies a year that they were no longer profitable and, sad to relate, had to be allowed to go out of print. They were finding the sale period of new books so short that comparatively large prices had to be charged. The situation certainly was becoming dangerous to literature.

In looking around for a stabilizing influence it was interesting to find at every turn the solid rationalism of the college library’s and the average professor’s recommendations and their effect in keeping alive—and when I say alive I mean actually in existence—many of the standard books, including the classics. A persistent demand was fostered which carried them through a very trying period. There was nothing exactly altruistic about this, it seemed the naturally conservative spirit of education asserting itself in accordance with its own needs.

To give something concrete let me call attention to Alumni Reading courses such as the University of Michigan’s 115 Reading Lists, prepared by the Extension Service of the University Library, and sent to alumni who request them.

This is doing a great good! Yet, just now one hears on all sides the lament that there are so few worth while, satisfying, “permanent” new books. Literature seems at one of its low ebbs. It is suffering from the recent orgy of indiscrimination. The rally will somehow be staged around, based upon the old standard books. It always has been so. Without being obtrusive in their importance, they act as stabilator and criterion, as stimulant and guide.

And holding them together so that none is forgotten is the, let us hope, permanently impelling force of education as it is now constructed. Why should not all worth-while books be immortalized, set apart as "*the literature*," and added to, each year, in every college list. The growing interest in good high school libraries everywhere, is a wonderful thing. The fact that the college library need not cater to the public taste, in fact may dictate absolutely what the students shall be given to read, has put it into a very important position. Its catalogues show that waste is minimized and permanent value made the keynote of the collections, as well as of the carefully selected private libraries that are so often and so farsightedly deeded to the colleges. The tremendous importance of these concentrated collections of literature is gradually becoming a well-known thing. They may well be one of the most important supports of alumni and adult education.

The average mortal, to be sure, does not know or perhaps care where literature is running to in this age of transition. And yet backgrounds are important and links are of value. If every manuscript were, before publication, subjected to the test of whether it is worthy to be placed on the shelf of the college library, there would be a great change for the better and very many less titles on the market.

It is senseless to flounder in mediocrity. The book business is its own worst enemy. No other industry on earth has dared to disappoint the public as much and as often, while holding out a few plums as a lure. And yet the public remains rather consistently loyal and continues to hopefully hunt for something instructive or entertaining among a flood of trash and potboilers that makes the titles of value look like Pharoah's followers in the Red Sea.

I am not trying to offer any solution, for there are already too many altruists. Everyone seems ready to take endless trouble to improve or reform everyone else, and nowhere is this more true than in the book business. Think of the censorship messes. We know that the finer things in literature, that may never be surpassed or equalled, deserve to be preserved and carried on to form perpetual standards. We know that the crude and ephemeral will always fall by the wayside. Therefore eventually

all will be well; but meanwhile what are we losing? How many are going to take time and pains to prepare great works?

Textbooks are in a class by themselves and outside of this discussion. Yet they may be called in here to offer an example. How many textbooks enjoy the large sale necessary to give proper compensation for all the labor that *should* be involved in the production of an adequate treatment of each subject? I venture to say not many. No, like other forms of literature to-day they are suffering in many cases from overproduction, mere needless duplication, and from the consequent lack of that care and painstaking labor in their writing which is necessary to make them altogether satisfactory and invulnerable. Therefore no sooner does one come out than a later one is under way to supersede it. The first may limp along for a time, leaning on new editions, but its doom has been sealed. And the chances are that its hastily written conqueror will prove to be no luckier. Oh, the waste! The high cost. Let changing educational trends occasionally alter texts, but why not also let the requirements be for a type of standard textbook which deserves to live and is made to live as a classic on its subject, and as such to be valued by the student and taken home for his library instead of being relegated to the ash pile, or at best sold to a second hand dealer for a few pence.

The college bookstore is undoubtedly on the way to great importance. The tendency is pronounced, to augment the list of textbooks sold, with selections from literature in general. Encouragement has in some cases been lacking, but like the college library, the college bookstore is in an enviable position if professors exert the same wise influence over its fortunes. Already the sales records of some show one fourth of the net returns as coming from general trade books. The encouragement of personal reading in colleges seems still in its infancy. Emerson lamented that colleges, while they provided libraries, furnished no Professor of Books. You may remember that he thought it only right that "some charitable soul, after losing a great deal of time among the false books, and alighting upon a few true ones which made him happy and wise, would do a right act in naming those which have been bridges or ships to carry him safely over dark morasses and barren oceans, into the heart of sacred cities, into palaces and temples." There is a re-

sponsibility here which rests directly on the colleges; why indeed should not every professor, regardless of his subject, be a professor of books?

The university presses, which a short time ago were turning out 300 new books per year and are growing very fast, rightfully fill a definite need; but they are sometimes led astray or rather outside of their legitimate field, and in such cases too often augment the indigestible literary mass and add, alas, to the book world's troubles. The presses, as publishers, are further evidence of the tremendous power the college can exert in literature. If, however, their work ever goes wrong, it is most surely a sad reflection on the college's literary policy.

Book-making may be called the business of a million errors. The average manuscript when presented to a publisher is a mass of mistakes—in grammar, in punctuation, in spelling and in many other ways. A large part of the worry and cost of production lies in correcting these. It is usually an entirely unnecessary cost which college education may well be expected to lessen and perhaps eventually to eliminate. Certainly the work that students do on college dailies and similar periodicals greatly aids them in this respect, and it is unfortunate that comparatively few can have such training or its equivalent.

I noted with interest that the next activity of the American Library Association will be the preparation of a list of 400 good books for the 275 junior colleges, to be followed by a general College Booklist giving in all, however, only between 12,000 and 15,000 titles. Such lists sound small when one considers the important literature of all time. But, compared with an average of 8,000 volumes in the present college library, it is large, and it can be added to. Like the man with the many children who, to avoid discord when they wanted a pet, bought a dachshund so that all of them could pat it at once, the selectors of a reading list should make it sufficiently long to satisfy every demand.

Interesting indeed are such forward movements as Rollins College's experiment in creating a Professor of Books, and several colleges, including Humboldt State Teachers College, in offering a course in "Recreational Reading" for students. Growing book-mindedness of the entire student body, under capable instruction in such cases, should result, and do much

to raise this country's average of less than two books per person per year.

If America in the coming age is to be judged to any great extent by her literature, it is only right that more and more stress be placed upon its production. And it must not be forgotten that real literature is perhaps only one half the result of training in writing, the other half of proper training in appreciation of good writing. One can scarcely exist without the other. The day should be closed when books are bought in place of wall paper, or for the color of their bindings, or by the square foot. And due appreciation of type styles and of format in general might well play a part.

One should not be able to say that the kind of book which millions will read cannot have literary or intellectual value. The minority party "capable of that exhilarating and strenuous pursuit of truth and beauty which great literature demands" can surely be increased. There is only one answer to the question why do people not read more and read more seriously; it rests with educational institutions; it is training or the lack of it. The ground seems fertile enough. With habitual book buyers numbering according to the calculation of Mr. R. L. Duffus, not more than 4 or 5 per cent of the population, it might be asked whether the schools and especially the universities and colleges have not been derelict in the past. As Mr. Duffus expresses it: "America has not been 'sold' on books. Our people want books whenever they are made to realize what books have to offer them."

It might be claimed that whatever void exists is the publishers' fault, but it goes deeper than that. The book trade has done its very best, with the material at hand, and cannot single handed make this a book reading nation. Until such time comes, this country cannot produce a great literature.

It is not really the book trade's business to improve the popular taste in reading matter. To be sure the publisher tries it, so does the retailer, but both lose thereby. It is the work of a higher authority; one not commercially involved. I do not hesitate to express the opinion that the key to literature's future greatness rests in the schools and colleges. They may now be doing considerable for it, but they have not as yet given it anything like the amount of attention it merits.

THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE IN THE STATE UNIVERSITY

WILLIAM LOWE BRYAN

PRESIDENT OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY

"FATHER," said a youth of my acquaintance some years ago, "what work shall I take at Williams College?" "Son," said the father "assuming that you like your grandfather and myself are to be physician or surgeon, my advice is that you take what work you please at Williams, provided you take nothing that has anything to do with medicine or surgery." The boy accepted that program. He went through Williams College, taking very little that had anything to do with medicine or surgery, then had his professional schooling and apprenticeship and now a dozen years later has his place at the front beside his eminent father in Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Without doubt Dr. Porter is a far better physician because he knows so many things that have nothing directly to do with medicine or surgery. Doubtless also the fact that besides being a physician he is a man to whom nothing belonging to a man is alien will enrich all the days of his life.

This is the fine ideal of the liberal arts college, whether it exists within one of the real American universities, one of the major planets, or as a little planetoid school in the bleak darkness out beyond Neptune. That is the ideal. It has friends. It has enemies. What I have to say is that the most serious enemy of the liberal arts college ideal is not the school of medicine nor the school of engineering nor any other professional or technical school but is the liberal arts college itself as it exists today, whether within or without a university.

In 1910 at Madison, I heard President Woodrow Wilson, then of Princeton University, set forth his ideal for the liberal arts college. The undergraduate curriculum, he said, should be composed of three parts: pure science, pure literature, pure history. I remember incidentally his saying that he had lately addressed a company of smug self-satisfied millionaires in New York and said he: "I took great satisfaction in saying to them that the object of a liberal arts college is to make their sons as different

as possible from themselves." No one could excel President Wilson in a statement of the liberal arts college ideal. Nevertheless, in the Princeton official bulletin of that year one finds the announcement of a combined arts-engineering course wherein there appear about two years of work accepted for the bachelor's degree which was neither pure literature, pure history nor pure science but definitely technical. What Princeton was doing in 1910 most of the arts colleges were doing and are now doing. Under that arrangement bread-winning studies take about half the undergraduate courses away from the non bread-winning studies.

Sometimes the cut goes deeper. Our institutions have very generally a combined arts-medical curriculum with two years or with three years in the college of arts followed by four or more years in the school of medicine. As a rule, however, the pre-medical student who takes this combined arts-medical course scarcely touches what President Wilson called pure literature, pure history or even pure science. Most of what this boy does in college is to drive straight toward the knowledge which is believed to make a doctor. Essentially the same thing may occur in any other collegiate department. Consider such departments as technical geology, physics and chemistry. Each June the American Telegraph and Telephone Company, the General Electric, General Motors, Firestone, Dupont, Edison and others descend upon the colleges in search of brains, as Colonel Rees has expressed their purpose. Each year the industries take thousands of college graduates into their laboratories. They make severe selections. It is hard to win a place in one of these exacting laboratories, harder to stay there. Undergraduates discover that to win and hold such a place means a competitive race. They must train for it. They are tempted to let other things go—history, literature, everything that does not help win the race to the job. Always there are undergraduates who resist this temptation. Always there are some who elect the long and costly way of my Fort Wayne boy who became a doctor. But thousands of boys in the colleges take the short cuts. They win the title, bachelor of arts, ignorant of much which that title was assumed to mean fifty years ago.

With what concern, with what alarm do many professors of humanistic subjects regard this offense against the ancient ideal

of the liberal arts college. But I now dare to say that many professors of humanistic subjects commit exactly the same offense against that same ideal.

Our departmental system which has displaced the general non-vocational curriculum of fifty years ago tempts every department in the college to become primarily a breeding place for specialists each department after its kind. Take two extreme but actual cases. One boy has had his major in a technical field. He has worked hard at that. He has won a place in an industrial laboratory. He is likely, as our phrase is, to make good there. But history, language, literature—he has barely glimpsed. He has escaped from them as much as possible and he is likely to go through life a stranger and a foreigner from these major human interests. The other boy's major is in a humanistic field. He has worked through college with the purpose of becoming a specialist and a professor in that field. Physical science has lain outside his interests. He has got through with or away from it as inexpensively as possible. He has had no glimpse of what science means to a scientist, and he will go through life an alien and a foreigner from the science which is revolutionizing the ideas, beliefs and practices of mankind.

These two bachelors of arts are matched. Both of them and the teachers of both it is who have changed the American college of arts from what it was in 1880 to what it is in 1931. Last year I studied the history of a college of arts, its changing curricula and the occupations of its graduates for the period from 1830 to 1916. In the half century between 1830 and 1880 scarcely a man did anything in college which had direct application to the profession which he was later to follow. In the years between 1900 and 1916, the majority of the men followed their majors in chemistry, physics, history, Latin or whatever else, directly toward the professions by which later they were to make their living.

What we had in the middle of the last century for better or for worse was a general non-vocational curriculum. What we now have for better and for worse is departmentalism which is in part vocationalism.

We have been driven from what we were to what we are by pressures, which have proved irresistible. The lengthening time

required in the schools that precede the college and in the schools that follow the college have driven the college to make concessions and now the college cannot quickly or easily recede. Short cuts of some kind are at this date inescapable.

The situation as a whole is made more difficult by the enormous increase in the whole body of knowledge to which the school as a whole must provide an introduction. The difficulty is very inadequately met by capsule courses filled with abstractions. For, as Agassiz is reported to have said to William James, one does not get further into an abstraction than he is led by his personal experiences. The capsule of abstractions so full of significance to the professor who compounds it is apt to lie undigested in the mind of a freshman unless it creates in him an indigestion of conceit.

There remains this substantial consolation that always a good many superior youths follow in college the Wilson formula, pure science, pure history, pure literature, winning often distinguished success in the vocations which they later adopt. Wherever there is such a youth the ancient liberal arts college is still alive.

TREE PLANTING AT SWARTHMORE COLLEGE—1913

"Do you covet honor? You will never get it by serving yourself. Do you covet distinction? You will get it only as a servant of mankind. Do not forget then, as you walk these classic places, why you are here. You are not here merely to prepare to make a living. You are here in order to enable the world to live more amply, with greater vision, with a finer spirit of hope and achievement. You are here to enrich the world, and you impoverish yourself if you forget your errand."

—Woodrow Wilson.

THE FUNCTION OF THE COLLEGE IN THE INDEPENDENT UNIVERSITY

GEORGE A. WORKS

DEAN OF STUDENTS AND UNIVERSITY EXAMINER, THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

IT was the intention of President Hutchins to discuss with you the implications of the program which is now under consideration at the University of Chicago as the answer of one institution to the question raised by the central theme of this part of your program. It is unfortunate that conditions have arisen which prevent his attendance this morning. No member of the faculty is in position to present so vividly and so clearly the proposed changes and to interpret their significance as is their author. The plan is so largely his own and he has considered it from so many angles that the presentation made by another is necessarily drab in comparison with that which President Hutchins would have made on this occasion. Especially is this true when it is necessary to go so far down the staff as to press a dean into the service; for the dean is indeed a lowly animal on the University of Chicago campus by virtue of the fact that he is only "one among many."

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES

A brief statement of the administrative changes involved will assist in an understanding of the program which has been proposed for the University of Chicago. Such a statement will be given at this time but should not lead one to the conclusion that these changes are the important elements since they are only means to the University's two great purposes—research and instruction.

When the University of Chicago opened on October 1, 1930, it consisted of the Colleges of Arts, Literature and Sciences; two graduate schools—the Ogden Graduate School of Science and the Graduate School of Arts and Literature; and the several professional schools. Now, it is composed of the College, and the four Divisions—Humanities, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, Social Sciences, and the several professional schools. The last of these will be left for consideration at a later point

in the discussion. Each of these units has an officer bearing the title of dean, who has administrative responsibility for the budget and the programs of teaching and research in his unit. Formerly each department dealt directly with the president's office in budgetary matters. Now, department heads will deal with their respective deans in budgetary and other similar matters.

THE COLLEGE

For the College no definite period of years has been set. The completion of the work in this unit will not be determined by the student's accumulation of a given number of units of credit, but rather by his ability to meet the requirements of a comprehensive examination. The work is being planned on the assumption that the average student will spend two years in the College. The comprehensive examinations will be offered at the end of the Autumn, Winter, and Spring Quarters. Certainly some students will be able to prepare themselves to successfully meet these tests in less than two years and they will be given the opportunity to do so. It is equally true that some individuals will require a longer period. No degree will be granted upon completion of the College.

The discussion up to this point has dealt with what has already been agreed upon by faculty and administration. At this stage it seems best to turn to a consideration of things projected which are still live topics of discussion on the campus.

The curriculum of the College is such a topic. The curriculum as proposed by President Hutchins is designed to achieve two purposes: First, to give the student a general education. Second, to prepare the student for further study in one of the Divisions or in a professional school provided he is interested in further study and proves his ability to profit by it.

The bare essentials of the proposed curriculum and the suggested procedures for putting them into effect are:

1. A lecture course in each of the four fields represented by the Divisions, viz., Physical Sciences, Biological Sciences, Humanities, and the Social Sciences. Syllabi would be prepared containing outlines of the material to be covered in the lectures, also lists of references. These lectures would be given to students in large groups. Attendance would be optional. Students

preferring to take the syllabi and study by themselves would be free to do so. Students who were desirous of obtaining a general education only would limit their attention to the field of the lectures and the readings. When a student and his advisor deem it wise the student would be permitted to take the examination. Success in passing this examination would permit of a graceful exit from the College, but it would not entitle the student to further study in the University of Chicago without additional examination.

2. Preparation for study in one of the Divisions. This would be provided through two additional elements:

a. A conference group for each of the Divisional fields. These groups would be broken up into sections of not to exceed twenty students. A student would be admitted to small group instruction in a section when he had decided upon a field of interest and demonstrated ability in the field. Presumably a student will not attend the lectures of the field in which he has been admitted to the small group instruction since these conference groups would be concerned with a more intensive study of the materials included in the lectures.

b. When a student has been admitted to a conference section he will then be eligible to take certain other courses that may be preparatory to work in the Division in which he plans to specialize. Included in this group would be such subjects as foreign languages, mathematics, and statistics. These will be given, as at present, on the quarterly basis. They are referred to as "tool" subjects.

At this point it should be noted that the proposed plan calls for the transfer of the instruction in English composition from the formal courses in this subject to the conference groups and such written work as may be done in connection with the lectures. The former would, of course, offer much more opportunity for instruction of this type than would the latter.

In the conference groups and in the classes in the tool subjects the students would obtain the special instruction to meet the requirements of the Division beyond the preparation necessary to meet the demands of the comprehensive examination for exit from the College. This will make it necessary for the student who wishes to go on with work in one of the Divisions to take the

general comprehensive examinations and, in addition, such tests as might be set up for admission to a Division.

The requirements for admission to the Divisions and the courses to be offered in them are questions to be decided. It is entirely too early to make any predictions except of a very general character as to what is likely to happen. It is evident that the adoption of the comprehensive examination by the College faculty as the means for measuring student progress will call for some modification of the present system of the accumulation of majors as a means of measuring this progress above the College level. There is considerable discussion of the use of some form of comprehensive examination in connection with the requirements for the baccalaureate degree. The logic of the situation points to the acceptance of this idea. Under the new plan the requirements for the bachelor's degree will be determined by each Division for the students specializing in that Division. It is quite probable that the faculties of the separate Divisions will wish to lay down some general requirements that will have to be met by all students recommended for degrees by the respective Divisions.

It is evident that the new organization is almost certain to result in a closer integration of the work of what was formerly the senior college and the graduate and research programs of the Divisions. Furthermore, it is believed that the proposed organization will facilitate the development of the University's program of graduate work and research. This many of us believe to be the University of Chicago's unique opportunity.

Let us turn to a brief consideration of some of the educational questions raised by the proposed program. In a recent address,¹ President Hutchins made the following statement:

The College curriculum is of extreme importance. The four-year college of the liberal arts has remained the hard core of American education. Great changes have gone on below it and above it; it has remained practically unmoved. The University of Chicago has now determined to introduce some new ideas into it, and the question is what those ideas shall be. One idea has already been introduced, and that is

¹ Robert Maynard Hutchins, "The Reorganization of the University of Chicago," reprint from *The University Record*, Vol. XVII, No. 1, January, 1931, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. p. 7.

the notion of general education as a problem distinct from advanced study. That notion has been dramatized by setting up a faculty with a separate dean and a separate budget to deal with general education. The real difficulty comes in determining what a general education is. It certainly is not whatever the upper divisions think students coming to them ought to know. If it were that, preparation for the college examinations would take the average student not two years but six. On the other hand the upper divisions may well insist that the college student should come to them with a good grounding in the divisional field and most of the tools that he will need in working in it. And we should all insist that a general education was something more than the ability to talk politely though somewhat vaguely on almost any topic. The task in brief then is to give a sound general education to those who want nothing more and to give a specific orientation in the divisional field to those planning to enter it, without at the same time ruining their general education by premature specialization.

Manifestly, the determination of the content of the four general lecture courses and the student activities that are to accompany them are very important considerations. It is certain that different faculties attacking these problems would arrive at different solutions. All that can be said for such a solution as may be devised by the College faculty is that it represents the viewpoint of the faculty regarding the function of the College in the University of Chicago. We know now as a result of studies made of the programs that have been followed by students during the junior-college period that they will enter upon their specialization with a greater breadth of preparation than they are obtaining under our present system. The proposed program would make provision for familiarizing the student with the larger concepts in all fields of knowledge to the degree that is practicable within the time available.

The freedom students will have in attending lectures is viewed with alarm by some. It should be borne in mind that printed syllabi covering the several fields will be available as well as samples of the comprehensive examinations that are to be used. Furthermore, a system of educational counselling will be provided that will furnish advice to the student with reference to the adaptation of his activities to his previous preparation and

the demands of the curriculum. It will provide an opportunity for the student to adapt his further study to his present preparation and a freedom as to time and method of doing this that he does not have under the present system. This very situation may result in the freeing of much more student energy than we now anticipate.

COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATIONS

It is realized that the comprehensive examination is a vital element in the program of the College. There is frank recognition of the need for an experimental approach to this problem as well as to other phases of the proposed changes. The large measure of dependence that would be placed upon comprehensive examinations makes it very important that they be of the appropriate type. It will be a matter of importance to have means of measuring student achievement possessing a greater degree of reliability than the usual types of examinations. In recent years much progress has been made in the development of objective tests. However, one of the decided limitations of the tests of this type thus far developed lies in the fact that they are primarily measures of the extent to which students have acquired information. It is important to measure acquisitions of this nature, but certainly no college faculty would be willing to regard this as the primary outcome of their efforts at teaching, to say nothing of its being regarded as the sole result.

Important as it is for students to gain information, college teachers regard it as even more important for them to show progress in such respects as the following:

1. Growth in power to think effectively in new situations involving materials from the fields of instruction.
2. Increased ability to use the processes and skills acquired in later study and in life outside the classroom.
3. Greater capacity in the collection and organization of facts for specific ends.

A high degree of correlation may obtain between achievement in these several respects and the acquisition of information, but at present we know relatively little about this phase. Any system of comprehensive examinations established by the College should recognize the tentative state of our knowledge with refer-

ence to this relationship. In the formulation of the plans for the examinations cognizance should be taken of the entire range of results sought, and tests with the maximum degree of objectivity practicable should be devised. If this is not done, but instead the emphasis is placed exclusively or even mainly on the informational side in the comprehensive examinations the entire instructional staff will be given a set in teaching that will throw the emphasis on the acquisition of information as the goal to be sought. If this should be the result it is difficult to see that the new plan would represent much of an advance over the present one in which student progress is measured by the accumulation of course credits.

The final plans for the administration of the comprehensive examinations have not been arranged. The probability is that provision will be made for a Board of Examiners consisting of faculty members representative of the several interests. This Board would have associated with it a staff to deal with such technical problems as standardization of tests, putting tests in their final form, and the marking of papers.

PROFESSIONAL SCHOOLS

To simplify the discussion the professional schools have been omitted from the consideration thus far. The School of Education has become a member of the Division of Social Sciences. What the others do is a matter to be determined by their faculties. President Hutchins has on several occasions expressed the hope that the professional schools would see fit to accept the graduates of the College without further preparation. Final action, however, rests with the faculties of the schools concerned.

Studies now in progress in the University of Chicago Law School are furnishing interesting information on this question. In the Autumn Quarter of 1924, 1925, and 1926, 112 students with four years of college preparation and 202 with three years of college preparation were admitted to the Law School. At the time of the study, after all who progressed regularly had sufficient time to complete their work, it was found that 47.3 per cent of the four-year group and 61.3 per cent of the three-year group had been graduated. Students completing their course with an average of 80 or more are graduated *cum laude*. As

measured by this criterion the four-year men showed a slight superiority. Fifteen per cent of them received this distinction as compared with 13.7 per cent of the three-year men.

In order to be graduated a student must have completed twenty-seven majors with an average of 70 or better. When a comparison is made of the two groups with reference to the proportion that have attained a mark of 70 or better on all examinations it is found that the percentage is 40.1 for the four-year group and 54.4 for the three-year group. The superiority of the three-year students in the respects that have been detailed raises the question of whether or not the policy of accepting students with three years of college work may not tend to draw those of superior ability into the Law School at this stage of their progress. If this were true, the superior records of the three-year group might be explained on the basis of greater native ability. The best measure that was available of the relative ability of the two groups was their scholastic records in undergraduate study previous to admission to the Law School. For obvious reasons this study was limited to those who had made their undergraduate preparation at the University of Chicago.

In this group there were thirty-three four-year students and 133 three-year students. A tabulation was made of the distribution of grade points for the students in each group. It was found that the median number earned by the four-year students was 3.6 as contrasted with 3.1 for the three-year group. As measured by collegiate records the four-year students were superior to the three-year students.

ADMINISTRATION

Attention has already been called to the fact that the reorganization has as its primary objective facilitating research and instruction. Aside from this it should represent a gain from the administrative aspect. Under the old organization all departments carried their budgets directly to the office of the president. The result was that over seventy budgets had to be adjusted there. Obviously it was impossible for that office to counsel wisely in all cases and to effect the best adjustments of funds to such a great diversity of interests. The new organization places the responsibilities of this nature with the deans of the Divisions

and the College who are charged with studying the needs of their respective units. Under the old arrangement the deans of the Colleges and the deans of the two Graduate Schools had no budgetary responsibilities.

Before closing this discussion it might be well to make a summary of what actually has been accomplished to date since achievement and proposed changes have been more or less intermingled in the treatment of the subject. The Junior College, the Senior College and the two Graduate Schools have been replaced by the following Divisions: Biological Sciences, Humanities, Social Sciences, and Physical Sciences, and the College. It has been voted that beginning with the class entering next fall the measurement of the intellectual progress of students in the College will be determined by the use of the comprehensive examination rather than by the accumulation of course credits.

The curriculum to be offered in the College, the character of the changes in the Division, and the relationship of the professional schools—excepting the School of Education—are still matters for further consideration.

In discussing the proposed changes, President Hutchins, in reply to criticisms, has frequently emphasized the importance of bearing in mind the fact that the plan is not perfect. His claim is that it is a better plan than the one the University has had. Certainly if it is adopted it will furnish a new base from which to operate in attacking many of the significant problems of college education. At least, it seems certain to bring a material modification of the function of the College in the University of Chicago.

THE FUNCTION OF THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGE

MARION E. PARK

PRESIDENT OF BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

WHEN it falls to me to speak for the independent college I must deal with function or change or continuation in something which has existed as an American institution far longer than the Federal government, indeed, for almost three hundred years. It is no fairly new enterprise, that is, like the American university itself, the junior college or the scientific or social institute, and certainly not a take-off into space like the system of technical education in Soviet Russia. In 1636, however, the independent college was a genuine and a unique experiment though an unconscious one. The Puritan immigrants who were familiar with Oxford and Cambridge, with clustered colleges making up a university, would have been startled and probably pleased to realize that in attempting to reproduce one of them isolated from the others they were creating a new form in education. They planted their crude school in Cambridge as calmly as we might stick a willow twig into damp soil and let it grow, and I can't forbear to add that its founders would have been still more startled and perhaps less pleased if they knew that a female was representing in this generation the descendants of their invention.

Their experiment was itself satisfactory, and it proved a fertile idea. As emigration moved for the next two hundred years, slowly at first over to the Connecticut valley, across the Berkshires into New York and New Jersey, and at last more quickly toward and across the West, and in one section after another the same pioneer conditions repeated themselves, the success of that early solution of the same problem stayed in the minds of the livelier communities and clothed itself in action. No university or junior college marred our simple pattern in those days, and for the two hundred years the birth rate continued large. Historically, clearly, the discussion of the function of the independent college should have preceded rather than followed the treatment of its apotheosis into the body politic of the university. By the time of the Civil War New England and

the Middle West were dotted with colleges symbolized by the familiar architectural trinity set in grass and trees—the chapel, the recitation hall and the president's house.

The stock of the college was the same but its branches varied. With the coming into existence of Johns Hopkins University in 1876 a major variation began. A few, though only a few, relatively speaking, of these independent colleges and especially in the large cities—that in Cambridge itself, for instance, in New Haven, in New York, in Philadelphia, added to themselves the necessary faculties and expanded into independent universities as Trinity College has expanded and is expanding into Duke University before our eyes to-day. But during the whole period, and up to now, variations minor as compared with this but approaching major ones have also existed. While the majority of the institutions founded as colleges continued under the old ensign, for a hundred reasons or combinations of reasons they developed differently, and they continue so to do. At the present moment some of the colleges which I represent have two thousand or more students, some a few hundreds, with a faculty and staff corresponding. Some have kept rigorously to tradition and educate only men. The group of progressives who from the 60's on saw to it that education should be possible for women were fairly successful in the West in sending girls to the colleges along with boys, and many of the independent colleges, especially in that region, are happily coeducational. But in the East, the conviction of the community of what was expedient and "proper," resulted in separate colleges for women. Some colleges, again, have been heavily endowed, and some must meet a high proportion of their expenses by their tuition fees and always sail close to the wind. Some have come into connection or competition, as friend or enemy, with a nearby university and have rearranged themselves to meet this contact. Others, like the old woman locked into a closet who lived for two hours "with," as she said, "no ventilation but her own breath," isolated and localized, remain unaffected by anything at all. Religious control keeps firm hold of a few, a control under which most of us started, but which, where it exists at all, remains with most of us hardly more than a gesture.

The variety is so great that it is in fact hard to find a genuine, important common denominator, or to put it more lightly, a spring board from which to dive into to-day's discussion of our function. Yet it is all important for us psychologically to make together rather than separately an attempt to define our place in the American educational system. No definition of the members of that system is easy. They are, in fact, not defined. They do not march like the planetary system in regular order, with regular intervals and regular natural influences, an army of unalterable law. We, for instance, are barged into by the elongation of the high school into the junior college on the one side; on the other, the graduate school steals from us the senior year to interlock it with the professional school. And we could protest more intelligently, if it is right for us to protest at all, if we had in our own minds a more positive conception of our value. For we are put on the defensive by the magnificent development of the university, by the popularity of the high school, and indeed by the collective tendencies of the age we live in. I seem to notice signs of an occasional inferiority complex, but I venture to speak to-day of our functions not so much to release a complex as to think aloud for twenty minutes what often boils away in my mind, as it does in yours.

We think of ourselves, members of faculties or executives, as the group most directly concerned in the college. For that reason we are constantly told that we do not see the woods for the trees. Can we then define the function of the college by seeing it through the eyes of others immediately concerned? First, the students. What do they think our function is when they are neither grandiloquently sentimental or scornful? A few have a genuine intellectual curiosity and go into our libraries or laboratories or take advantage of the short cuts which the college offers to satisfy it. A few wish to go on to professional work and expect us to give them preliminary training. The majority expect nothing very definite of us. They, or their families for them, want to keep on "going to school" and are looking for about the same pabulum as that which they have found in the high school, a taste of everything, nothing too hard and nothing too long. They intend to stay a year or two, or through four years if their wishes can be met and unless the work demands too

long hours and too desperate a mental pull. An honest description of this large battalion is disheartening; and yet we must look at them with attention, for it is from the group outside those who have recognized intellectual desire, who run on their own steam, that we must add to the much smaller group which already knows its own mind. For the last class want less and even for the sake of the noisy, undemanding, trivial life which is possible in many colleges are hardly willing to make an exertion in return. It is unprofitable for us, is it not, to search the readings of us by the majority of the undergraduates of the moment? What of the alumni? They are the undergraduates of last year. Many of them keep their undergraduate picture of us, probably as meaningless as their actual experience of us was. In other cases later success or failure blackens or whitens our memory. In general, we are praised or criticized by alumni more often than we are understood—probably because the college itself has not defined itself clearly to them. How about our trustees? How does the average board look at its legal charge? They wish us to give an education which keeps well inside the budget, to retain alumni interest, but usually not to stir too much the attention of the community. They genuinely welcome a ten strike in the way of a brilliant faculty achievement, or a large enrolment. But their often wise caution, their wrapping of our initiative in cotton wool, however necessary, tends to weaken their help in bringing us to the core of the question as to the real purpose of the college. The community which we touch? It has too many opinions to be more than briefly generalized. It is affected in its reading of us by its own intellectual level, by the accidental contact it has made with individuals. And beyond our limited reach into the limited community lies a numerically far larger community which knows nothing about us at all. From no one of these sources, it seems to me, do we, close to the college itself, get a definition of our place in education which will serve us as a basis of action. But suppose that we could bring together a small group of the friends of each college—faculty, students, trustees, representatives of the community—those of Solomon's "wisdom and understanding," who neither underestimate nor overestimate our possibilities, who know the small areas of America which we touch and the greater America beyond, and

so appreciate that their suggestions may look to us like dipping out the sea with a thimble—suppose that I put the question to them as to what they believe to be the function of my particular independent college in the American community. I think they might answer me something like this:

“Side by side with other institutions you in your particular independent college have in your hands young women between eighteen and twenty-two who are being trained, as far as that special four years or any four years will do it, to take their place in American life. You have the advantage that all your attention can be on them. The interest of the undergraduate student will never take with you the secondary or the fractional place which it often must do with the highest administrative members of a university or the most learned and brilliant members of its faculty. You are not deflected by questions which rise in connection with professional or vocational education, with wide research facilities, with great community responsibilities. Further, you have the better chance for relation between teacher and student, for granted that the universities draw off the learned and brilliant scholar, his teaching must be shared with the professional and graduate students, and the undergraduates must fall often to the much larger group of less experienced men. You are not overwhelmed by numbers. Finally, you can pretty well control your conditions of living, and make them dovetail into the life of the classroom and the laboratory. Your relations can still be natural and human.

“These advantages you have in dealing with your section of young Americans. Recognizing them, what do you use them for?—what is your function? You are not training your students for your own ends or keeping them tied to you. You send them out into American communities in which they must play some part, intelligent or stupid. The complications, the seemingly insolvable difficulties ahead of America in the next generation, we don’t need to point out. There are explosives everywhere; if the statement of them is the first step in the solving, America is hardly beginning to take that now.

“First of all, you need to make women. The complexity of the immediate situation needs not the child’s acquiescence or disagreement, but the hard-won judgment of the experienced adult,

that maturity which makes the individual hard, not of heart but of mental muscle, serious, not as opposed to gay but as opposed to trivial or irresponsible, which can make possible work without pleasure and self satisfaction as a daily background. The common lack of the really interesting in the education which you still placidly pursue, the trivial student life which is taken for granted as an accompaniment of that education owe their origins to a provincial, simple, childish America, but they are also actually factors which have contributed to keeping America a nation of boys, as Mr. Madariaga calls us. You educate 'girls,' it is true. Yet during exactly the four years in which you are plotting the course and steering the ship the official change from immaturity to maturity, from childishness to stability takes place; they are licensed, as it were, to take part in the government, to handle money, to bring up a family. You must confess that often the mental change behind that superficial symbol has never come about and that you have sent out into America in June a parcel of graduates who are girls still, who accept their irresponsibility and feel—for lack of being told the contrary—that a seal has been set upon it by an approving Alma Mater. You have been training swimmers for the shallows in too many cases, not for deep channel swimming. If your power of single attention to a problem, if your direct relation between teacher and student, if your more manageable size, if your more complete control of external conditions mean anything at all, you ought to be able to bring into American education something less superficial, more developing than you are doing at present.

And second, you need to make your student know and enjoy the use of her own brain. You need to train her to estimate differences and recognize something of the order in which things stand—poor, good, better. You need to give her work on which she learns to occupy herself steadily for a considerable time so that her brain does not weary in well-doing. You need, in short, to make her mind an accurate, strong tool, adjustable to many more operations than the untrained mind can perform."

If this is our function and just such a group of people as I have mentioned have convinced me that it is, certainly two things lie on the very threshold of our plans—a selection of students, and a selection of curriculum. Hard as this is to accomplish, it will be for many of us a relief from an attempt to do everything

with any material that presents itself. The selection of students I will not enlarge on except to emphasize that it means not only a choice between those offering themselves, but a pressure on schools to unite with us in the kind of training we wish to give, and an education of parents and alumni and community to want what we want.

But a more important selection must be made in the curriculum. Our emphasis and the reasons for it should be clear. If we wish to focus the student's attention we must begin by focusing our own. What can be learned by an ordinary person with ordinary resources outside of college can safely be left out of the college catalogue to vocational schools or to the initiative of the boy or girl. We should simplify our courses by the rejection of the non-essentials, and whatever is included should pass a sharp test as to its value in the new America. We have prided ourselves on passing on the tradition of the past. For a generation I believe, at least, that must be given a second place, and we must cease our emphasis on it. It may well be that in time we shall swing back to it with a new approach and a more productive result. At the moment we must weigh the courses we offer for their production of mature and thoughtful students, their emphasis on estimate of values and on clear thinking. I believe that actually in the arrangements of the college budget, in the calling of the faculty, in the asking for money we should emphasize such courses—sciences, mathematics, philosophy, logic and what is closely connected with them. Even in such subjects, further, the lower regions are less productive than the later. A wide variety of elementary courses gives no such return to the student as his induction into the greater knowledge and more advanced method of one field. When we have more mature students studying the great mind training disciplines and those carried beyond the elementary stage, I believe that we shall turn out of the colleges and into the American community men and women more nearly able to cope with the complicated dangers of the life of the next fifty years than our generation has been. But I believe that the fight is not only for students more prepared to live in the America of the next generation but is for our own existence. Such training must certainly come about. Unless our form of institution is fitted to accomplish it some other form will surely come to the kingdom to meet the emergency.

MINUTES OF THE SEVENTEENTH ANNUAL
MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION OF
AMERICAN COLLEGES

January 22-23, 1931

Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Indiana

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22

First Session

THE Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges was called to order by the President of the Association, Dean Luther P. Eisenhart of Princeton University, in the Assembly Room of the Claypool Hotel, Indianapolis, Indiana, on Thursday morning, January 22, 1931, at ten o'clock.

The Executive Secretary announced the appointment by the President of the following committees:

Committee on Resolutions: President William Lowe Bryan, Indiana University, Chairman, President L. W. Boe, St. Olaf's College, Dean C. S. Boucher, University of Chicago, President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College, President Allan Hoben, Kalamazoo College.

Committee on Nominations: Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College, Chairman, President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, President Louis B. Hopkins, Wabash College, President Franklin W. Johnson, Colby College, President J. K. Montgomery, Muskingum College.

The annual report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary was presented by the Executive Secretary, Dr. Robert L. Kelly. It was

Voted, That the report of the Executive Committee and the Executive Secretary be received and that the items in that report requiring action be adopted.

This action included (1) the adoption of the budget as presented subject to such modification as the incoming Executive Committee may see fit to make; (2) reference to the Committee on Resolutions of the amendment to the constitution of the Association increasing the additional members on the Executive Committee from two to four, and (3) the admission of the following colleges to membership in the Association:

Albany College, Albany, Oregon
 Barnard College, New York, N. Y.
 Battle Creek College, Battle Creek, Mich.
 The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
 Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.
 Good Counsel College, White Plains, N. Y.
 Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.
 Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney, Va.
 Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood, Cal.
 Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte, N. C.
 LaSalle College, Philadelphia, Pa.
 LaVerne College, LaVerne, Cal.
 Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, N. C.
 Loyola University, New Orleans, La.
 Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pa.
 Mount St. Joseph College, Chestnut Hill, Pa.
 Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, Cal.
 Nazareth College, Rochester, N. Y.
 Newberry College, Newberry, S. C.
 Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa.
 Saint Bonaventure's College, Saint Bonaventure, N. Y.
 Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove, Pa.
 Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas
 Union University, Jackson, Tenn.
 Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va.

The annual report of the Treasurer was presented by the Treasurer of the Association, President William Mather Lewis of Lafayette College. It was

Voted, That the annual report of the Treasurer be accepted and be placed on file.

The report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers was presented by the chairman of that Commission, President Ernest H. Wilkins of Oberlin College. It was

Voted, That the report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers be accepted, and it was further

Voted, That the recommendations contained in that report be referred to the Committee on Resolutions.

President Wilkins also presented for the consideration of the Committee on Resolutions a proposal for the appointment of a committee to consider and report on the question of modifications

from the stated entrance requirements of the colleges to encourage the study of Chinese and Japanese by American students resident in China and Japan. The reference was so made.

The report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship was presented by the chairman of that Commission, President Henry M. Wriston of Lawrence College. It was

Voted, That the report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship be accepted, and it was further

Voted, That the report be referred to the Committee on Resolutions for further consideration of the project referred to in that report.

The report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds was presented by the chairman of that Commission, Trustee Alfred Williams Anthony of Bates College. It was

Voted, That the report of the Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds be accepted, and be placed on file.

The report of the Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning was submitted by the chairman of that Committee, President Donald J. Cowling of Carleton College. It was

Voted, That the report of the Committee on Standard Reports for Institutions of Higher Learning be accepted and be placed on file.

The President introduced Dr. Edward B. Wilson, President of the Social Science Research Council, who spoke briefly on the mutual interests of that Council and of this Association.

The report of the Commission on Educational Surveys was presented by the chairman of that Commission, President Frank L. McVey of the University of Kentucky. It was

Voted, That the report of the Commission on Educational Surveys be accepted and be placed on file.

President Robert P. Pell of Converse College presented for the consideration of the Committee on Resolutions, a proposal for an investigation of college music courses offered for purposes of general education. The reference was so made.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 o'clock.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 22

Second Session

The second session of the meeting, held in the Assembly Room of the Claypool Hotel, was called to order by President Eisenhart at 2:45 o'clock Thursday afternoon, January 22.

Colonel Robert I. Rees, of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, spoke on "College Men in Business."

Under the general theme of "Mass Education on the College Level," Dean Melvin E. Haggerty of the University of Minnesota discussed "The Peril in Mass Education," President A. Lawrence Lowell of Harvard University gave an illustrated talk on "The Harvard House Plan," and President Kerr D. Macmillan of Wells College discussed "Mass Education at College Level" from the point of view of the small college.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 o'clock, so that the delegates might attend the reception provided by the Indianapolis Branch of the American Association of University Women at the Indianapolis Athletic Club.

Third Session

The annual dinner of the Association was held in the James Whitcomb Riley Room of the Claypool Hotel Thursday evening, January 22, at 7:00 o'clock, with the President of the Association presiding.

The newly elected President of the Council of Church Boards of Education, Dr. Gould Wickey of the Board of Education of the United Lutheran Church in America, offered the invocation.

Following the dinner, the meeting was called to order by President Eisenhart, who in his presidential address discussed the proposal of the Executive Committee of the Association that an investigation be made of the use of the comprehensive examination in colleges of liberal arts and sciences.

Dr. Lorado Taft of Chicago and Dr. John Erskine of New York spoke on "The College and the Fine Arts."

On motion of President William C. Dennis of Earlham College, the Association by a rising vote expressed its appreciation to its Executive Secretary, Dr. Robert L. Kelly, for his guidance of the Association and his contribution to American education

and for the magnificent program of this meeting, held in his home state.

A musical program by the DePauw University Choir, under the direction of Dean Robert Guy McCutchan, was rendered during the course of the evening.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 o'clock.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 23

Fourth Session

The fourth session of the meeting, held in the Assembly Room of the Claypool Hotel, was called to order by President Eisenhart at 9:45 o'clock, Friday morning, January 23.

On behalf of the Committee on Resolutions, Dean C. S. Boucher of the University of Chicago recommended the adoption of the following resolutions, which considered seriatim, were all adopted.

Resolved, That a Committee of Three be appointed by the President to consider and report what action if any may properly be taken by this Association with reference to the following matter brought to its attention by the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations:

The United States needs, from the point of view of scholarship, business and professional activities, and diplomacy, a supply of American citizens familiar with the Chinese and Japanese languages. Practically the only source from which this supply may be drawn is the group of American boys and girls who prepare for college admission in the American schools of the Far East. The majority of them already speak the vernacular, but they hesitate, in view of the technicalities of admission to college, to take the time to acquire a knowledge of the literary language. What modifications, if any, may properly be made from the stated entrance requirements of American colleges to permit such students to receive appropriate recognition, toward entrance, for the ability to speak, read and write either Chinese or Japanese?

Resolved, That the part of the report of the Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship, expressing a desire for authorization to study the reading habits of faculty members in a representative group of colleges, be referred to the incoming Executive Committee for favorable consideration, provided the money, from \$2000 to \$3000, necessary to conduct the investigation, can be secured.

Resolved, That the request that a committee be appointed to conduct an investigation into college music courses offered

for purposes of general education, and to make a comprehensive report setting forth those courses in the study of music which are sufficiently high in standard to merit the respect of the liberal arts college, and also setting forth the best method to impress upon the student that music is a necessary part of a liberal education, be referred to the incoming Executive Committee for favorable consideration, provided the necessary funds can be made available.

Resolved, That the following amendment to the constitution, which was presented to the Association a year ago, be adopted: "The sentence under 'Officers' in the constitution which reads, 'The Association shall also elect two others who, with the four officers named above (that is, the President, Vice President, Secretary, and Treasurer) shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association,' shall be changed to read, 'The Association shall elect four others, etc.'"

Resolved, That the part of the report of the Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers, proposing a factual inquiry to ascertain the actual number of members of each of the last ten graduating classes who are engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the percentage of the class represented by this number; and the actual number of persons in the upper quarter of each of the same ten classes who are engaged in or preparing for college teaching, and the percentage of those in the upper quarter of the class represented by this number; and the proposal that the Secretary of the Association prepare blanks for use in such inquiry, and distribute them to the member colleges—be referred to the incoming Executive Committee for favorable consideration, provided the necessary funds can be made available.

Resolved, That it should be called to the attention of member colleges that the George Washington Bicentennial Commission, in Washington, D. C., stands ready to furnish material bearing on the phases of Washington's career as an intellectual and literary man who believed in education, to any college which may desire to honor the memory of Washington by some sort of function in which material of the sort mentioned may be of service, on the two hundredth anniversary of his birth.

The Committee on Nominations, through its chairman, Dean Raymond Walters of Swarthmore College, placed before the Association the nominations of officers and members of the Executive Committee and of the permanent commissions and committees. It was

Voted, That the report of the Committee on Nominations be accepted and that the Secretary be instructed to cast the unanimous vote of the Association accordingly.

The Secretary having cast that vote, the following officers and members of the Executive Committee and of the permanent commissions and committees of the Association were declared elected for the year ending January, 1932:

President: President Ernest H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

Vice President: Registrar J. P. Mitchell, Stanford University

Executive Secretary: Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City

Treasurer: President William Mather Lewis, Lafayette College

Custodian of Funds: Bank of New York and Trust Company, New York City

Additional members of the Executive Committee:

Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University

President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University

Rector James H. Ryan, The Catholic University of America

American Council on Education:

Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo (one year)

President Guy E. Snavelly, Birmingham-Southern College (two years)

President J. Edgar Park, Wheaton College (Mass.) (three years)

National Research Council:

Professor Arthur H. Compton, University of Chicago, 1931-32

Commission on College Architecture and College Instruction in Fine Arts:

President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College, *Chairman*

President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation

President W. P. Few, Duke University

Mr. J. Fredrick Larson, Dartmouth College

Mr. A. B. Ruddock, Occidental College

Commission on the Cost of College Education:

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*

Controller C. C. Wintringer, Princeton University

Controller Lloyd Morey, University of Illinois

Auditor N. C. Plimpton, University of Chicago

Controller Robert B. Stewart, Purdue University

Commission on Educational Surveys:

President Frank L. McVey, University of Kentucky,
Chairman

Director C. H. Judd, University of Chicago
President David A. Robertson, Goucher College

Commission on Enlistment and Training of College Teachers:

President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University,
Chairman

President Albert Britt, Knox College
Dean Marshall S. Brown, New York University
Dean Charles L. Raper, Syracuse University
President E. H. Wilkins, Oberlin College

Commission on Faculty and Student Scholarship:

President Henry M. Wriston, Lawrence College, *Chairman*
Dean C. S. Boucher, The University of Chicago
Dean C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College
Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo
President C. D. Gray, Bates College

Commission on Permanent and Trust Funds:

Dr. A. W. Anthony, Bates College, *Chairman*
Treasurer Charles T. Brown, Swarthmore College
Treasurer F. L. Jackson, Davidson College
President Rees E. Tulloss, Wittenberg College
Assistant Treasurer Raymond L. Thompson, University
of Rochester

Committee on Publications:

The President, *ex-officio*
The Executive Secretary, *ex-officio*
The Treasurer, *ex-officio*

President Joseph Wharton Lippincott, of the J. B. Lippincott Company, spoke on "The College as a Conservator of the Best Literature."

Under the general theme of "The Function of the College," President William Lowe Bryan of Indiana University spoke from the point of view of the college in the state university, Dean George A. Works of the University of Chicago from the point of view of the college in the independent university, and President Marion E. Park of Bryn Mawr College from the point of view of the independent college.

The meeting adjourned *sine die* at 12:00 noon.

(Signed) ARCHIE M. PALMER,
For the Secretary.

MEMBERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES, 1931

The Association of American Colleges is not a standardizing agency. Election to membership does not involve any kind of academic status except that stipulated in the *By-Laws* of the Association. By order of the Association, in the case of universities the unit of membership is the university college of liberal arts. Unless otherwise indicated the name of the president or the chancellor is given in the column headed Executive Officer.

| | |
|-------------|-------------------|
| INSTITUTION | EXECUTIVE OFFICER |
|-------------|-------------------|

ALABAMA

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| Alabama College, Montevallo..... | O. C. Carmichael |
| Birmingham-Southern College, Birmingham..... | Guy E. Snavely |
| Howard College, Birmingham..... | Theophilus R. Eagles, <i>Acting</i> |
| Judson College, Marion..... | Harry H. Clark |
| Spring Hill College, Spring Hill..... | Joseph M. Walsh |
| Woman's College of Alabama, Montgomery..... | W. D. Agnew |

ARIZONA

| | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|
| University of Arizona, Tucson..... | Homer Le Roy Shantz |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|

ARKANSAS

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Arkansas College, Batesville..... | Ury McKenzie, <i>Acting</i> |
| Hendrix-Henderson College, Conway..... | J. H. Reynolds |
| Ouachita College, Arkadelphia..... | Charles D. Johnson |

CALIFORNIA

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Claremont Colleges | |
| Pomona College, Claremont..... | Charles K. Edmunds |
| Scripps College, Claremont..... | E. J. Jaqua |
| Dominican College, San Rafael..... | Sister M. Raymond, <i>Dean</i> |
| College of the Holy Names, Oakland..... | Sister Mary Austin, <i>Dean</i> |
| Immaculate Heart College, Hollywood..... | Sister Margaret Mary |
| La Verne College, La Verne..... | Ellis M. Studebaker |
| Mills College, Mills College..... | Aurelia H. Reinhardt |
| Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles..... | Sister Mary Dolorosa |
| Occidental College, Los Angeles..... | Remsen duBois Bird |
| College of the Pacific, Stockton..... | Tully C. Knoles |
| University of Redlands, Redlands..... | V. Leroy Duke |
| St. Mary's College, Oakland..... | Brother Lewis |
| University of Southern California, Los Angeles..... | R. B. Von KleinSmid |
| Stanford University, Stanford University..... | Robert E. Swain, <i>Acting</i> |
| Whittier College, Whittier..... | W. F. Dexter |

COLORADO

| | |
|---|-----------------------|
| Colorado College, Colorado Springs..... | Charles C. Mierow |
| University of Denver, Denver..... | Fred M. Hunter |
| Loretto Heights College, Loretto..... | Sister M. Edmond Fern |

CONNECTICUT

| | |
|--|------------------|
| Connecticut College for Women, New London..... | Katharine Blunt |
| Trinity College, Hartford..... | Remsen B. Ogilby |
| Wesleyan University, Middletown..... | J. L. McConaughy |
| Yale University, New Haven..... | James R. Angell |

DELAWARE

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|
| University of Delaware, Newark..... | Walter Hullihen |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------|

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| The American University, Washington..... | George B. Woods, <i>Dean</i> |
| The Catholic University of America, Washington..... | James H. Ryan |
| George Washington University, Washington..... | C. H. Marvin |
| Georgetown University, Washington..... | Coleman Nevils |
| Howard University, Washington..... | Mordecai W. Johnson |
| Trinity College, Washington..... | Sister Julia of the Trinity |

FLORIDA

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Florida State College, Tallahassee..... | Edward Conradi |
| John B. Stetson University, Deland..... | Lincoln Hulley |
| Rollins College, Winter Park..... | Hamilton Holt |
| Southern College, Lakeland..... | Ludd M. Spivey |

GEORGIA

| | |
|---|------------------|
| Agnes Scott College, Decatur..... | James R. McCain |
| Brenau College, Gainesville..... | H. J. Pearce |
| Emory University, Emory University..... | Harvey W. Cox |
| Georgia State College for Women, Milledgeville..... | J. L. Beeson |
| University of Georgia, Athens..... | C. M. Snelling |
| Mercer University, Macon..... | Spright Dowell |
| Morehouse College, Atlanta..... | John Hope |
| Piedmont College, Demorest..... | Henry C. Newell |
| Shorter College, Rome..... | W. D. Furry |
| Spelman College, Atlanta..... | Florence M. Read |
| Wesleyan College, Macon..... | Wm. F. Quillian |

IDAHO

| | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|
| Gooding College, Wesleyan..... | Charles W. Tenney |
| College of Idaho, Caldwell..... | W. J. Boone |

ILLINOIS

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Augustana College, Rock Island..... | Gustav A. Andreen |
| Aurora College, Aurora..... | O. R. Jenks |
| Bradley Polytechnic Institute, Peoria..... | F. R. Hamilton |
| Carthage College, Carthage..... | Jacob Diehl |
| University of Chicago, Chicago..... | C. S. Boucher, <i>Dean</i> |
| DePaul University, Chicago..... | Francis V. Coreoran |
| Eureka College, Eureka..... | Clyde L. Lyon |
| Greenville College, Greenville..... | Leslie R. Marston |
| Illinois College, Jacksonville..... | Charles H. Rammelkamp |
| Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington..... | Wm. J. Davidson |
| James Millikin University, Decatur..... | Jesse H. White |
| Knox College, Galesburg..... | Albert Britt |
| Lake Forest College, Lake Forest..... | H. M. Moore |
| Loyola University, Chicago..... | Joseph Reiner, <i>Dean</i> |
| McKendree College, Lebanon..... | Cameron Harmon |
| MacMurray College, Jacksonville..... | Clarence P. McClelland |
| Monmouth College, Monmouth..... | T. H. McMichael |
| Mount Morris College, Mount Morris..... | C. Ernest Davis |
| North Central College, Naperville..... | E. E. Rall |
| Northwestern University, Evanston..... | Walter Dill Scott |
| Rockford College, Rockford..... | William A. Maddox |
| Rosary College, River Forest..... | Sister Mary Ruth |
| St. Viator College, Bourbonnais..... | J. W. P. Maguire |
| St. Xavier College for Women, Chicago..... | Mother M. Sophia Mitchell |
| Shurtleff College, Alton..... | George M. Potter |
| Wheaton College, Wheaton..... | James O. Buswell |
| Y. M. C. A. College, Chicago..... | Edward C. Jenkins |

INDIANA

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Butler University, Indianapolis..... | Robert J. Aley |
| De Pauw University, Greencastle..... | Garfield B. Oxnem |
| Earlham College, Richmond..... | William C. Dennis |
| Evansville College, Evansville..... | Earl E. Harper |
| Franklin College, Franklin..... | Homer P. Rainey |
| Hanover College, Hanover..... | Albert G. Parker, Jr. |
| Indiana Central College, Indianapolis..... | I. J. Good |
| Indiana University, Bloomington..... | Wm. L. Bryan |
| Manchester College, North Manchester..... | Otho Winger |
| University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame..... | Chas. L. O'Donnell |
| Rose Polytechnic Institute, Terre Haute..... | Donald P. Prentice |
| St. Mary's of Notre Dame, Notre Dame..... | Mother M. Pauline |
| St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, St. Mary of the Woods, | |
| | Mother Mary Raphael, <i>Acting</i> |
| Taylor University, Upland..... | John Paul |
| Wabash College, Crawfordsville..... | L. B. Hopkins |

IOWA

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Buena Vista College, Storm Lake..... | A. C. Nielsen, <i>Acting</i> |
| Central College, Pella..... | John Wesseling |
| Clarke College, Dubuque..... | Sister Mary Clara Russell |
| Coe College, Cedar Rapids..... | Harry M. Gage |
| Columbia College, Dubuque..... | Thomas Conry, <i>Acting</i> |
| Cornell College, Mt. Vernon..... | Herbert J. Burgstahler |
| Drake University, Des Moines..... | Daniel W. Morehouse |
| University of Dubuque, Dubuque..... | Paul H. Buchholz |
| Grinnell College, Grinnell..... | J. H. T. Main |
| Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant..... | James E. Coons |
| Luther College, Decorah..... | Oscar L. Olson |
| Morningside College, Sioux City..... | Frank E. Mossman |
| Parsons College, Fairfield..... | Clarence W. Greene |
| Penn College, Oskaloosa..... | H. Clark Bedford, <i>Acting</i> |
| Simpson College, Indianola..... | John L. Hillman |
| Western Union College, Le Mars..... | D. O. Kime, <i>Acting</i> |

KANSAS

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Baker University, Baldwin City..... | Wallace B. Fleming |
| Bethany College, Lindsborg..... | Ernest F. Pihlblad |
| College of Emporia, Emporia..... | John B. Kelly |
| Friends University, Wichita..... | W. O. Mendenhall |
| Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina..... | L. B. Bowers |
| McPherson College, McPherson..... | V. F. Schwalm |
| Ottawa University, Ottawa..... | Erdmann Smith |
| St. Mary's College, St. Mary's..... | Charles O'Hara, <i>Acting</i> |
| Southwestern College, Winfield..... | R. L. George, <i>Acting</i> |
| Sterling College, Sterling..... | Ross T. Campbell |
| Washburn College, Topeka..... | P. P. Womer |
| University of Wichita, Wichita..... | Harold W. Foght |

KENTUCKY

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| Asbury College, Wilmore..... | L. R. Akers |
| Berea College, Berea..... | W. J. Hutchins |
| Centre College, Danville..... | Charles J. Turck |
| Georgetown College, Georgetown..... | William B. Jones, <i>Acting</i> |
| University of Kentucky, Lexington..... | Frank L. McVey |
| University of Louisville, Louisville..... | R. A. Kent |
| Nazareth College, Louisville..... | Sister Berenice, <i>Dean</i> |
| Transylvania College, Lexington..... | Arthur Braden |

LOUISIANA

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport..... | George S. Sexton |
| Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston..... | Geo. W. Bond |
| Loyola University, New Orleans..... | John W. Hynes |
| Southwestern Louisiana Institute, Lafayette..... | Edwin L. Stephens |

MAINE

| | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------|
| Bates College, Lewiston..... | Clifton D. Gray |
| Bowdoin College, Brunswick..... | Kenneth C. M. Sills |
| Colby College, Waterville..... | Franklin W. Johnson |
| University of Maine, Orono..... | Harold S. Boardman |

MARYLAND

| | |
|---|------------------------------|
| Goucher College, Baltimore..... | David A. Robertson |
| Hood College, Frederick..... | Joseph H. Apple |
| University of Maryland, College Park..... | Raymond A. Pearson |
| Morgan College, Baltimore..... | John O. Spencer |
| College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore..... | Sister M. Ethelbert |
| St. John's College, Annapolis..... | Robert E. Bacon, <i>Dean</i> |
| St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg..... | Sister Paula |
| Washington College, Chestertown..... | Paul E. Titsworth |
| Western Maryland College, Westminster..... | A. N. Ward |

MASSACHUSETTS

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Amherst College, Amherst..... | Arthur S. Pease |
| Boston College, Boston..... | James H. Dolan |
| Boston University, Boston..... | Daniel L. Marsh |
| Clark College, Worcester..... | Wallace W. Atwood |
| Harvard University, Cambridge..... | A. Lawrence Lowell |
| Holy Cross College, Worcester..... | John M. Fox |
| International Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield..... | L. L. Doggett |
| Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley..... | Mary Emma Woolley |
| Radcliffe College, Cambridge..... | Ada L. Comstock |
| Simmons College, Boston..... | Henry Lefavour |
| Smith College, Northampton..... | W. A. Neilson |
| Tufts College, Tufts College..... | John A. Cousens |
| Wellesley College, Wellesley..... | Ellen F. Pendleton |
| Wheaton College, Norton..... | J. Edgar Park |
| Williams College, Williamstown..... | Harry A. Garfield |
| Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester..... | Ralph Earle |

MICHIGAN

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Adrian College, Adrian..... | Harlan L. Feeman |
| Albion College, Albion..... | John L. Seaton |
| Alma College, Alma..... | Harry Means Crooks |
| Battle Creek College, Battle Creek..... | Paul F. Voelker |
| Hillsdale College, Hillsdale..... | Wm. Gear Spencer |
| Hope College, Holland..... | Wynand Wichers |
| Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo..... | Allan Hoben |
| Marygrove College, Detroit..... | George Hermann Derry |
| Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, East Lansing..... | Robert S. Shaw |
| University of Michigan, Ann Arbor..... | John R. Effinger, <i>Dean</i> |
| Olivet College, Olivet..... | James King |

MINNESOTA

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| Augsburg College, Minneapolis..... | George Sverdrup |
| Carleton College, Northfield..... | D. J. Cowling |
| Concordia College, Moorhead..... | J. N. Brown |
| Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter..... | O. J. Johnson |
| Hamline University, St. Paul..... | Alfred F. Hughes |
| Macalester College, St. Paul..... | John C. Acheson |
| College of St. Catherine, St. Paul..... | Sister Antonia |
| St. Olaf College, Northfield..... | L. W. Boe |
| College of St. Teresa, Winona..... | Sister Mary A. Molloy, <i>Dean</i> |
| College of St. Thomas, St. Paul..... | Matthew Schumacher |

MISSISSIPPI

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Blue Mountain College, Blue Mountain..... | Lawrence T. Lowrey |
| Millsaps College, Jackson..... | David M. Key |
| Mississippi College, Clinton..... | J. W. Provine |
| Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus..... | R. E. L. Sutherland |
| University of Mississippi, University..... | Joseph N. Powers |

MISSOURI

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Central College, Fayette..... | Robert H. Ruff |
| Culver-Stockton College, Canton..... | John Hepler Wood |
| Drury College, Springfield..... | T. W. Nadal |
| Lindenwood College, St. Charles..... | John L. Roemer |
| University of Missouri, Columbia..... | F. M. Tisdal, <i>Dean</i> |
| Missouri Valley College, Marshall..... | Geo. H. Mack |
| Park College, Parkville..... | F. W. Hawley |
| St. Louis University, St. Louis..... | Robert S. Johnston |
| Tarkio College, Tarkio..... | Robert M. Montgomery |
| Washington University, St. Louis..... | George R. Throop |
| Webster College, Webster Groves..... | Mother Mary Linus, <i>Acting</i> |
| Westminster College, Fulton..... | M. E. Melvin |
| William Jewell College, Liberty..... | John F. Herget |

MONTANA

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Intermountain Union College, Helena..... | Wendell S. Brooks |
|--|-------------------|

NEBRASKA

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Cotner College, Bethany..... | L. C. Anderson |
| Creighton University, Omaha..... | Wm. H. Agnew |
| Doane College, Crete..... | Edwin B. Dean |
| Grand Island College, Grand Island..... | George Sutherland, <i>Acting</i> |
| Hastings College, Hastings..... | Calvin H. French |
| Midland College, Fremont..... | H. F. Martin |
| Nebraska Wesleyan Univ., University Place..... | I. B. Schreckengast |
| York College, York..... | J. R. Overmiller |

NEW HAMPSHIRE

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Dartmouth College, Hanover..... | Ernest M. Hopkins |
| University of New Hampshire, Durham..... | E. M. Lewis |

NEW JERSEY

| | |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Georgian Court College, Lakewood..... | Mother Mary John |
| The New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, | |
| | Mabel S. Douglass, <i>Dean</i> |
| Princeton University, Princeton..... | Luther P. Eisenhart, <i>Dean</i> |
| Rutgers University, New Brunswick..... | Philip Brett, <i>Acting</i> |
| College of St. Elizabeth, Convent Station..... | Sister Marie José, <i>Dean</i> |
| Upsala College, East Orange..... | Carl G. Erickson |

NEW MEXICO

| | |
|--|-----------------|
| University of New Mexico, Albuquerque..... | J. F. Zimmerman |
|--|-----------------|

NEW YORK

| | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| Adelphi College, Garden City..... | Frank D. Blodgett |
| Alfred University, Alfred..... | Boothe C. Davis |
| University of Buffalo, Buffalo..... | Samuel P. Capen |
| Canisius College, Buffalo..... | Rudolph J. Eichhorn |
| Colgate University, Hamilton..... | George B. Cutten |
| Columbia University | |
| Barnard College, New York..... | Virginia C. Gildersleeve, <i>Dean</i> |
| Columbia College, New York..... | Herbert E. Hawkes, <i>Dean</i> |
| St. Stephen's College, Annandale-on-Hudson..... | B. I. Bell, <i>Warden</i> |
| Cornell University, Ithaca..... | Robert M. Ogden, <i>Dean</i> |
| D'Youville College, Buffalo..... | Mother Saint Edward, <i>Acting</i> |
| Elmira College, Elmira..... | Frederick Lent |
| Fordham University, New York..... | Aloysius J. Hogan |
| Good Counsel College, White Plains..... | Mother M. Aloysia |
| Hamilton College, Clinton..... | Frederick C. Ferry |
| Hobart College, Geneva..... | Murray Bartlett |
| Keuka College, Keuka Park..... | A. H. Norton |
| Manhattan College, New York..... | Brother Cornelius |
| Marymount College, Tarrytown-on-Hudson..... | Sister M. Gerard |
| College of the City of New York, New York..... | F. B. Robinson |
| College of Mt. St. Vincent, New York..... | Sister Miriam Alacoque, <i>Dean</i> |
| College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle..... | John P. Chidwick |
| New York University, New York..... | Marshall S. Brown, <i>Dean</i> |
| Niagara University, Niagara Falls..... | John J. O'Byrne |
| University of Rochester, Rochester..... | Rush Rhees |
| Russell Sage College, Troy..... | J. L. Meader |
| College of the Sacred Heart, Manhattanville..... | Grace C. Dammann, <i>Acting</i> |
| Saint Bonaventure's College, Saint Bonaventure..... | Thomas Plassman |
| St. John's College, Brooklyn..... | Thomas F. Ryan, <i>Dean</i> |

| | |
|--|--------------------------------|
| St. Joseph's College for Women, Brooklyn..... | William T. Dillon, <i>Dean</i> |
| St. Lawrence University, Canton..... | Richard E. Sykes |
| College of St. Rose, Albany..... | Sister M. Gonzaga, <i>Dean</i> |
| Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs..... | Henry T. Moore |
| Syracuse University, Syracuse..... | Charles W. Flint |
| Union College, Schenectady..... | Frank P. Day |
| United States Military Academy, West Point | William R. Smith |
| Vassar College, Poughkeepsie..... | H. N. MacCracken |
| Wagner College, Staten Island..... | Frederic Sutter, <i>Acting</i> |
| Wells College, Aurora..... | Kerr D. Macmillan |

NORTH CAROLINA

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| Catawba College, Salisbury..... | Walter L. Lingle |
| Davidson College, Davidson..... | W. P. Few |
| Duke University, Durham..... | W. A. Harper |
| Elon College, Elon College | Raymond Binford |
| Guilford College, Guilford College..... | H. L. McCrorey |
| Johnson C. Smith University, Charlotte..... | H. E. Schaeffer |
| Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory..... | C. E. Brewer |
| Meredith College, Raleigh..... | J. I. Foust |
| North Carolina College for Women, Greensboro..... | H. E. Rondthaler |
| Salem College, Winston-Salem..... | Thurman D. Kitchin |
| Wake Forest College, Wake Forest | |

NORTH DAKOTA

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|
| Jamestown College, Jamestown..... | B. H. Kroeze |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|

OHIO

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| University of Akron, Akron..... | George F. Zook |
| Antioch College, Yellow Springs..... | Arthur E. Morgan |
| Ashland College, Ashland..... | Edwin E. Jacobs |
| Baldwin-Wallace College, Berea..... | Albert B. Storms |
| Bluffton College, Bluffton..... | S. K. Mosiman |
| Capital University, Columbus..... | Otto Mees |
| University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati..... | Herman Schneider |
| University of Dayton, Dayton..... | Bernard P. O'Reilly |
| Defiance College, Defiance..... | Albert G. Caris |
| Denison University, Granville..... | A. A. Shaw |
| Heidelberg College, Tiffin..... | Charles E. Miller |
| Hiram College, Hiram..... | Kenneth I. Brown |
| John Carroll University, Cleveland..... | B. J. Rodman |
| Kenyon College, Gambier..... | William F. Peirce |
| Lake Erie College, Painesville..... | Vivian B. Small |
| Marietta College, Marietta..... | Edward S. Parsons |
| Miami University, Oxford..... | Alfred H. Upham |
| Mount Union College, Alliance..... | W. H. McMaster |

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Muskingum College, New Concord | J. Knox Montgomery |
| Oberlin College, Oberlin | Ernest H. Wilkins |
| Ohio Northern University, Ada | Robert Williams |
| Ohio University, Athens | E. B. Bryan |
| Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware | Edmund D. Soper |
| Otterbein College, Westerville | W. G. Clippinger |
| St. John's College, Toledo | William H. Fitzgerald |
| St. Xavier College, Cincinnati | H. F. Brockman |
| University of the City of Toledo, Toledo | Henry J. Doermann |
| Western College for Women, Oxford | Ralph W. Hickok |
| Western Reserve University, Cleveland | R. E. Vinson |
| Wilberforce University, Wilberforce | Gilbert H. Jones |
| Wilmington College, Wilmington | B. O. Skinner |
| Wittenberg College, Springfield | Rees E. Tulloss |
| College of Wooster, Wooster | C. F. Wishart |

OKLAHOMA

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, Stillwater | H. G. Bennett |
| Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee | W. C. Boone |
| Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City | Eugene M. Antrim |
| Oklahoma College for Women, Chickasha | M. A. Nash |
| Phillips University, East Enid | I. N. McCash |
| University of Tulsa, Tulsa | John D. Finlayson |

OREGON

| | |
|----------------------------------|----------------|
| Albany College, Albany | Thomas W. Bibb |
| Linfield College, McMinnville | L. W. Riley |
| Pacific University, Forest Grove | John F. Dobbs |
| Reed College, Portland | N. F. Coleman |

PENNSYLVANIA

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Albright College, Reading | W. F. Teel |
| Allegheny College, Meadville | Clarence F. Ross, <i>Acting</i> |
| Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr | Marion Edwards Park |
| Bucknell University, Lewisburg | E. W. Hunt |
| Dickinson College, Carlisle | Mervin G. Filler |
| Drexel Institute, Philadelphia | Kenneth G. Matheson |
| Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster | Henry Harbaugh Apple |
| Geneva College, Beaver Falls | McLeod M. Pearce |
| Gettysburg College, Gettysburg | Henry W. A. Hanson |
| Grove City College, Grove City | Weir C. Ketler |
| Haverford College, Haverford | W. W. Comfort |
| Immaculata College, Immaculata | Anthony J. Flynn |
| Juniata College, Huntingdon | Charles C. Ellis |
| Lafayette College, Easton | William Mather Lewis |
| LaSalle College, Philadelphia | Brother E. Alfred |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Lebanon Valley College, Annville..... | G. D. Gossard |
| Lehigh University, Bethlehem..... | Charles Russ Richards |
| Lincoln University, Lincoln University..... | Wm. H. Johnson |
| Marywood College, Scranton..... | Mother Mary William Craig |
| Moravian College, Bethlehem..... | William N. Schwarze |
| Mount St. Joseph College, Chestnut Hill..... | Mother M. James |
| Muhlenberg College, Allentown..... | John A. W. Haas |
| Pennsylvania College for Women, Pittsburgh..... | Cora H. Coolidge |
| Pennsylvania State College, State College..... | R. D. Hetzel |
| University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia..... | Thomas S. Gates |
| University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh..... | John G. Bowman |
| Rosemont College, Rosemont..... | Mother Mary Ignatius |
| St. Francis College, Loretto..... | P. J. Sullivan, <i>Acting</i> |
| St. Thomas College, Scranton..... | Brother George Lewis |
| Seton Hill College, Greensburg..... | |
| Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove..... | G. Morris Smith |
| Swarthmore College, Swarthmore..... | Frank Aydelotte |
| Temple University, Philadelphia..... | Charles E. Beury |
| Thiel College, Greenville..... | E. Clyde Xander |
| Ursinus College, Collegeville..... | George L. Omwake |
| Villanova College, Villanova..... | James H. Griffin |
| Washington and Jefferson College, Washington..... | S. S. Baker |
| Westminster College, New Wilmington..... | W. Charles Wallace |
| Wilson College, Chambersburg..... | Ethelbert D. Warfield |

RHODE ISLAND

| | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|
| Brown University, Providence..... | Clarence A. Barbour |
| Providence College, Providence..... | Lorenzo C. McCarthy |

SOUTH CAROLINA

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| College of Charleston, Charleston..... | Harrison Randolph |
| The Citadel, Charleston..... | O. J. Bond |
| Clemson College, Clemson College..... | E. W. Sikes |
| Coker College, Hartsville..... | Carlyle Campbell |
| Converse College, Spartanburg..... | R. P. Pell |
| Erskine College, Due West..... | Robert C. Grier |
| Furman University, Greenville..... | W. J. McGlothlin |
| Limestone College, Gaffney..... | R. C. Granberry |
| Newberry College, Newberry..... | James C. Kinard |
| Presbyterian College, Clinton..... | John McSween |
| University of South Carolina, Columbia..... | D. M. Douglas |
| Winthrop College, Rock Hill..... | James P. Kinard |
| Wofford College, Spartanburg..... | Henry N. Snyder |

SOUTH DAKOTA

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell..... | Earl A. Roadman |
| Huron College, Huron..... | R. C. Agne |
| Yankton College, Yankton..... | George W. Nash |

TENNESSEE

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Carson and Newman College, Jefferson City..... | James T. Warren |
| University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga..... | Alexander Guerry |
| Cumberland University, Lebanon..... | Ernest L. Stockton |
| Fisk University, Nashville..... | Thomas E. Jones |
| Lincoln Memorial University, Harrogate..... | H. Robinson Shipherd |
| Maryville College, Maryville..... | Ralph W. Lloyd |
| Milligan College, Milligan..... | H. J. Derthick |
| University of the South, Sewanee..... | B. F. Finney |
| Southwestern, Memphis..... | Charles E. Diehl |
| Tusculum College, Greeneville..... | Charles A. Anderson |
| Union University, Jackson..... | H. E. Watters |
| Vanderbilt University, Nashville..... | J. H. Kirkland |

TEXAS

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Baylor College for Women, Belton..... | John C. Hardy |
| Baylor University, Waco..... | Samuel P. Brooks |
| Howard Payne College, Brownwood..... | Thomas H. Taylor |
| Incarinate Word College, San Antonio..... | Mother M. Columkille |
| Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio..... | H. A. Constantineau |
| Rice Institute, Houston..... | E. O. Lovett |
| Simmons College, Abilene..... | Jefferson D. Sandefer |
| Southern Methodist University, Dallas..... | Charles C. Selecman |
| Southwestern University, Georgetown..... | King Vivion |
| Texas Christian University, Fort Worth..... | E. M. Waits |
| Texas State College for Women..... | L. H. Hubbard |
| Texas Technological College, Lubbock..... | P. W. Horn |
| Trinity University, Waxahachie..... | J. H. Burma |

UTAH

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Brigham Young University, Provo..... | F. S. Harris |
| University of Utah, Salt Lake City..... | George Thomas |

VERMONT

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Middlebury College, Middlebury..... | Paul D. Moody |
| Norwich University, Northfield..... | Charles H. Plumley |

VIRGINIA

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Bridgewater College, Bridgewater..... | Paul H. Bowman |
| Emory and Henry College, Emory..... | J. N. Hillman |
| Hampden-Sydney College, Hampden-Sydney..... | J. D. Eggleston |
| Hollins College, Hollins..... | M. Estes Cocke, <i>Dean</i> |
| Lynchburg College, Lynchburg..... | J. T. T. Hundley |
| Randolph-Macon College, Ashland..... | R. E. Blackwell |
| Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg..... | Dice R. Anderson |
| University of Richmond, Richmond..... | F. W. Boatwright |
| Roanoke College, Salem..... | Charles J. Smith |
| Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar..... | Meta Glass |

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| Virginia Military Institute, Lexington..... | John A. Lejeune |
| Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Blacksburg..... | Julian A. Burruss |
| Virginia Union University, Richmond..... | William J. Clark |
| Washington and Lee University, Lexington..... | Francis P. Gaines |
| College of William and Mary, Williamsburg..... | J. A. C. Chandler |

WASHINGTON

| | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| Gonzaga University, Spokane..... | John J. Keep |
| College of Puget Sound, Tacoma..... | Edward H. Todd |
| Whitman College, Walla Walla..... | S. B. L. Penrose |

WEST VIRGINIA

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Bethany College, Bethany..... | Cloyd Goodnight |
| Davis and Elkins College, Elkins..... | James E. Allen |
| Marshall College, Huntington..... | Marshall P. Shawkey |
| Salem College, Salem..... | S. O. Bond |
| West Virginia State College, Institute..... | John W. Davis |
| West Virginia University, Morgantown..... | John R. Turner |
| West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon..... | Homer E. Wark |

WISCONSIN

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| Beloit College, Beloit..... | Irving Maurer |
| Carroll College, Waukesha..... | Wm. Arthur Ganfield |
| Lawrence College, Appleton..... | Henry M. Wriston |
| Marquette University, Milwaukee..... | Wm. M. Magee |
| Milton College, Milton..... | Jay W. Crofoot |
| Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee..... | Lucia R. Briggs |
| Mount Mary College, Milwaukee..... | Edward A. Fitzpatrick |
| Northland College, Ashland..... | J. D. Brownell |
| Ripon College, Ripon..... | Silas Evans |

HONORARY MEMBERS

American Association for the Advancement of Science
 American Association of University Professors
 American Association of University Women
 American Council of Learned Societies
 American Council on Education
 Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
 Carnegie Corporation
 General Education Board
 Institute of International Education
 National Research Council
 Rockefeller Foundation
 Social Science Research Council
 United States Office of Education
 Council of Church Boards of Education and its constituent Boards.

CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

THE purpose of the Association shall be the promotion of higher education in all its forms in the colleges which shall become members of this Association, and the prosecution of such plans as may make more efficient the institutions included in its membership.

Name: The name of this Association shall be the "Association of American Colleges."

Membership: All colleges which conform to the definition of a minimum college given in the By-Laws may become members of this Association. The General Secretaries of Church Boards of Education and officials of educational foundations and other cooperating agencies may be elected to honorary membership.

Representation: Every institution recognized as a member of this Association shall be entitled to representation in each meeting of the Association by an accredited representative. Other members of the Faculty or Board of Trustees of any institution belonging to this Association, the officers of Church Boards cooperating with such an institution and the representatives of foundations and other cooperating agencies, shall be entitled to all the privileges of representatives except the right to vote. Each institution recognized as a member of the Association shall be entitled to one vote on any question before the Association, the vote to be cast by its accredited representative.

Officers: The Association shall elect a President, a Vice-President, a Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be charged with the duties usually connected with their respective offices. The Secretary shall be the permanent executive officer of the Association, and shall serve without term until his successor is elected. The other officers shall serve for one year, or until their successors are duly elected. The Association shall also elect four others who, with the four officers named above, shall constitute the Executive Committee of the Association. The President of the Association shall be *ex-officio* chairman of the Executive Committee. The election of officers shall be by ballot.

Meetings: At least one meeting of the Association shall be held

in each calendar year. Special meetings may be called by the Executive Committee, provided that four weeks' notice be given each institution connected with the Association. Representatives of twenty-five members of the Association shall be necessary to form a quorum for the transaction of business.

By-Laws: The Association may enact By-Laws for its own government not inconsistent with the provisions of this Constitution.

Vacancies: The Executive Committee is authorized to fill vacancies *ad interim* in the offices of the Association.

Amendments: Amendments to the foregoing Constitution may be offered at any regular annual meeting, and shall be in writing, signed by the mover and two (2) seconds. They shall then lie on the table until the next annual meeting, and shall require for their adoption the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members then present.

BY-LAWS

1. In order to be eligible to membership in this Association institutions shall require fifteen units for admission to the freshman class and 120 semester hours, or an equivalent, for graduation.

2. Applications for membership shall be made to the Executive Committee, which shall, after investigation of the standing of the institution, recommend to the Association.

3. The annual dues shall be fifty dollars per member. Non-payment of dues for two successive years shall cause forfeiture of membership.

4. The place of the annual meeting of the Association shall be determined each year by the Executive Committee.

5. All expenditure of the funds of the Association shall be authorized by the Association, or, subject to later approval by the Association, by the Executive Committee.

6. The President shall appoint a Committee on Resolutions at the beginning of each annual meeting, to which shall be referred for consideration and recommendation all special resolutions offered by members of the Association.

7. The Secretary is authorized to mail three copies of all official bulletins to all institutions which are members of the Asso-

ciation. Additional subscriptions, either for the institution or for any officer or faculty member, may be made at a special rate.

POLICY

In accordance with the action of the Association, the working policy of the Association is a policy of *inclusiveness and inter-helpfulness rather than of exclusiveness*.

Adopted as revised January 23, 1931.

FORMER PRESIDENTS

- 1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College; *Constitution adopted*
- 1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College
- 1916-17 President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College
- 1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College
- President Hill M. Bell,* Drake University, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College
- 1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,* Wesleyan University
- 1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College
- 1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison University
- 1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College
- President Samuel Plantz,* Lawrence College, *Vice-President, presiding*
- 1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College
- 1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt University
- 1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College
- 1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan
- 1927-28 President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College
- 1928-29 President Trevor Arnett, General Education Board
- 1929-30 President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham-Southern College
- 1930-31 Dean Luther P. Eisenhart, Princeton University

* Deceased.